DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 050 SO 019 255

AUTHOR Rutkowski, Edward, Ed.
TITLE Papers and Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Midwest History of Education Society (21st, Chicago, Illinois, October 25-26, 1985).
INSTITUTION Midwest History of Education Society, Cedar Falls, IA.
PUB DATE 86
NOTE 131p.; For related documents, see SO 019 242-257.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT Journal of the Midwest History of Education Society; v14 1986

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Access to Education; Children; Compulsory Education; Consolidated Schools; *Educational History; Elementary Secondary Education; Equal Education; Females; Higher Education; Parent Background; Racial Discrimination; Rural Schools; Sex Discrimination; Social Influences; Teaching Methods; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS England; *Immigration; *Jesuits

ABSTRACT

The papers of this proceedings are presented in 5 parts. In part 1, "Education in Nineteenth Century Europe," the two papers describe the inception of the Ragged School Union in England and the educational opportunities in Naples. The titles are: "The Ragged Schools of Victorian England and Their Contribution to Child Emigration" (T. J. Phillips) and "Going to School in Early Nineteenth-Century Naples: The Youth of Francesco De Sanctis" (C. R. Wolf). Part 2, "Varieties of Quantitative History" contains three papers covering the conditions of Illinois common schools; the voluntary school attendance in Toledo (Ohio); and the occupational status of Scott High School (Ohio) male graduates, non-graduates, and their fathers. The titles are: "The Cost of Rural Schooling in Illinois in 1902" (W. Eaton); "Analysis of Manuscript Census Data for Fifteen- to Seventeen-Year-Olds in Toledo, Ohio, 1850-1900" (M. C. Grant); and, "Occupational Mobility in Graduates and Non-Graduates of an Urban High School, 1915-1925" (S. R. Snyder). "Gender and Culture in American Educational History" is the theme of part 3. Two papers describe the movement for equality in higher education by women and the education of the first generation of Americans of Mexican descent. The titles are: "Female Participation in the NEA, 1857-1912" (B. S. Handler) and "Social and Educational Influences Shaping the Mexican-American Mind: Some Tentative Thoughts" (G. San Miguel, Jr.). Part 4, "Classical Ideas in Theory and Practice" contains two papers on the similarities between Cicero and Quintilian on oratory education and the Jesuit educational system. The two titles are: "Oratory and Conduct in Cicero and Quintilian" (J. J. Chambliss) and "Loyola and the Jesuits: Masters of Educational Management, Method, and Teacher Preparation" (G. Arakapadavil). The final section, Part 5, "Historical Deja Vu" contains three papers which discuss the inception and the evolution of Cornell University's policies and practices; William Chandler Bagley's opposition to limiting educational access and opportunity; and Robert R. Sherman's book, "Understanding History of Education." The titles are: "The Rhetoric and Reality of Academic Standards at Cornell University, 1868 to 1890" (E. M. Brier); "Toward the Rehabilitation of William Chandler Bagley: Some Notes on His Views on Race and Gender" (E. V. Johanningmeier); and, "Understanding History of Education" (R. R. Sherman). The program, the business meeting minutes, and directory of attendance are included. (DJC).

ED298050

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Journal of the Midwest History of Education Society

Volume 14, 1986

Papers and proceedings of the 21st meeting

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

EDWARD RUTKOWSKI

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

30 014 355

Published by the
Department of Educational Psychology
and Foundations
College of Education,
University of Northern Iowa

Distributed and Published for the Society by the
Department of Educational Psychology and Foundations,
College of Education, University of Northern Iowa,
Cedar Falls, Iowa.

Copyright 1986 by the
Midwest History
of Education Society

Edited by
Edward Rutkowski

Any subscriptions or inquiries should be sent to:

Journal of the Midwest History of Education Society
Education Center, Room 513
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50614

Journal of the Midwest History of Education Society

Volume 14, 1986

Papers and proceedings of the 21st meeting

Published by the
Department of Educational Psychology
and Foundations
College of Education,
University of Northern Iowa

CONTENTS

Part I
EDUCATION IN NINETEENTH CENTURY EUROPE

The Ragged Schools of Victorian England.
Trevor J. Phillips,
Bowling Green State University 1

Going to School in Early Nineteenth-Century Naples: The Youth of Francesco De Sanctis
Charles R. Wolf,
The Spencer Foundation, Chicago 12

Part II
VARIETIES OF QUANTITATIVE HISTORY

The Costs of a Rural School — 1875-1910
William Eaton,
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale 22

Analysis of Manuscript Census Data for Fifteen- to Seventeen-Year-Olds in Toledo, Ohio, 1850-1900
Mary Grant,
University of Toledo 31

Occupational Mobility in Graduates and Non-Graduates of an Urban High School, 1915-1940
Sam R. Snyder,
University of Toledo 37

Part III
GENDER AND CULTURE IN AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL HISTORY

Female Participation in the N.E.A., 1857-1912
Bonnie Handler,
Central Connecticut State University 49

Social and Educational Influences Shaping the Mexican-American Mind: Some Tentative Thoughts
Guadalupe San Miguel, Jr.,
University of California, Santa Barbara 57

Part IV
CLASSICAL IDEAS IN THEORY AND PRACTICE

Oratory as Conduct in Cicero and Quintilian
J.J. Chambliss,
Rutgers University 68

Loyola and the Jesuits: Masters of Method, Management, and Teacher Preparation
George Arakapadavil,
Illinois State University 79

Part V
HISTORICAL DEJU VU

The Rhetoric and the Reality of Academic Excellence at Cornell University, 1868-1890
Ellen M. Brier,
University of Illinois at Chicago 86

William Chandler Bagley on Race and Gender
Erwin V. Johanningmeier,
University of South Florida 97

Understanding History of Education
Robert R. Sherman,
University of Florida 111

Part VI
PROGRAM AND PROCEEDINGS

Program 119

Minutes of the Business Meeting 121

Directory of Attendance 123

Part I
Education in Nineteenth-Century Europe

THE RAGGED SCHOOLS OF VICTORIAN ENGLAND AND THEIR CONTRIBUTION TO CHILD EMIGRATION

Trevor J. Phillips
Bowling Green State University

Two years ago I presented to the Society a paper entitled "The Farm School System of Nineteenth Century Europe and Its Legacy," an account of the philosophical origins of a phenomenon known as child emigration by which more than 100,000 juveniles were sent out from England from the early 1800s to World War II under various sponsors to selected parts of the Empire to escape a life of destitution and crime, to rid the country of its youthful derelicts, to help populate Greater Britain with preferable, though humble, stock.

This paper is a further attempt to throw additional light on my main theme and to show how the ragged schools played a not insignificant role in the growing child emigration movement. In fact, for a time many of them were known as colonial training schools in order to point up their main contribution and function: the offering of preparatory training for a new life abroad.[1]

As early as the 1830s, free schools for the destitute were to be found, established by the City Mission of London. Parents who valued even a minimal education for their children but who could not afford the 'school pence' charged by the schools operated by the national societies, could take advantage of these free schools.

The origin of the name 'ragged school' appears to be in dispute. According to a turn-of-the-century authority,[2] the first published reference was found in 'The Fifth Annual Report of the London City Mission,' presented in 1840. The pertinent passage reads:

> To the pages of the *London City Mission Magazine* your committee would refer you for many interesting reports of the labours and successes of the missionaries. During the past year several schools have arisen out of their labours, and five have been formed exclusively for children raggedly clothed . . .[3]

A contemporary researcher,[4] on the other hand, credits the actual invention of the term to the school treasurer of Field Lane Sunday School, R.S. Starey who employed it in an advertisement in *The Times* in 1843, 'as it forcibly and tritely expressed the low character and condition of the pupils, so thoroughly depraved in mind and ragged in apparel.'[5]

In order to grasp the full significance and role of the ragged schools of which, as early as 1849, there were 82 in London and its suburbs, with an attendance of upwards of 9,000, one must recall the social and economic plight of the unemployed in early Victorian England. Writing half-a-century later, historian Walter Besant imagined he was addressing social reformers and the chronic problem of juveniles in the 1840s:[6]

> Consider the children. You have saved them from the factory and from the pit. Save them now from themselves. There are more than a million children in England and Wales alone, wholly destitute of instruction. They learn nothing except what they see in the streets, in the fields, in the hedges, from each other, or from their elder brothers and sisters. Either there are no schools for them, or they do not go to any schools. A million of children! They will become men and women, all ignorant of everything; they will become the parents of perhaps four millions more, also all ignorant. You are creating a great class who will be more brutish, more dangerous, more besotted, more easily led, than any class of Englishmen in the whole history of England. More than a million children! In the city and suburbs of London alone there are a hundred thousand. There is an army for you! Fifty thousand boys, fifty thousand girls, all growing up in the blackest ignorance, without the least tincture of religion, morality, or principle; with no other rule for the conduct of life than that they must not be found out in doing certain things or they will be flogged horribly, transported across the seas, or hanged. Look at this army! A hundred thousand! Rub your eyes — open them — see for yourselves. There they are, if you can only see them; they are in duds and rags; they live by pilfering; they are like wild beasts for cunning in their prowl for prey; when they grow up they will be a noble army — the Devil's Own. Fifty thousand boys! fifty thousand girls! and all reeling as fast as they can go and with the greatest certainty, straight to the devil and to endless hell!

An editorial in the *Illustrated London News* provided a hard-hitting contemporary perspective:[7]

> To diminish crime is a more agreeable and more sacred duty [than punishment and reformation]; but hitherto, our efforts have been almost exclusively employed in the more vulgar and lazy task of the two. We have national establishments — prisons, penitentiaries, and hulks; we have armies of policemen, and a multitudinous array of people, from judges down to gaolers, solely employed on behalf of the nation in punishing crime; but we have, as yet, no national establishment for preventing it. While it has been proved, till the proof has become a truism, that nine-tenths of our criminals are persons who have received neither secular nor religious instruction, we have taken no efficient means to place the next generation in better circumstances. We have neglected the children of the destitute, and kept up judges, policemen, and gaolers for repression, when schoolmasters and schoolmistresses, and religious as well as secular instructors, were equally necessary for prevention . . .

In 1816, a Parliamentary Select Committee had been obtained, under the chairmanship of Lord Brougham, to investigate 'the education of the

lower orders in the Metropolis.' The committee's report expressed acute concern at the widespread ignorance and superstition that then existed, noting that only one person in sixteen was provided with an opportunity for education other than the inadequate facilities of the Sunday and Dame's Schools. The most provocative recommendation contained in the report was that a national system of education should be established, supported by a Parliamentary grant and managed by parish vestries and Anglican clergymen.[8] As can well be imagined, this recommendation alarmed the Dissenters in the country who, through the British and Foreign School Society had earlier joined with the established Church in the education of the poor but who now sensed a threat to their religious liberty were the Anglicans by law empowered to take exclusive control of schools. For Dissenters, including Quakers, Baptists, Methodists and Unitarians, the voluntary principle in education was paramount.[9]

When the report of the Committee was presented in 1820, it was denied a second reading in Parliament and thereby effectively defeated, due largely to the opposition generated in the ranks of the Dissenters upon learning of the national education provision and also of the recommendation that all teachers must be members of the Established Church. It would be no sooner than half-a-century before a national system of education became the law of the land.

By 1835, Lord Brougham estimated that 300,000 children in England and Wales lacked the means of education, despite the fact that the number of both schools and pupils had more than doubled since 1818.[10] Obviously, the mere availability of schooling was no guarantee of its being taken advantage of, and a national system could not be counted on to remedy this state of affairs, neither under Church nor Nonconformist auspices. The resulting compromise — a mixed system by which the government financed and inspected schools operated by voluntary societies — was unable to ameliorate the situation of the most destitute members of the society.

The reasons were not difficult to locate, and were well articulated by Mary Carpenter, whose efforts were responsible for much of the dramatic change that occurred within England's reformatory schools in the second half of the 19th century, but whose interests embraced the welfare of all poverty-stricken children. In 1851 she wrote:[11]

> Were we to undertake to clothe every child of poverty, every child of destitution and to keep them clothed . . . during their attendance at School, — did we use such precautionary measures while there, and on their way to and from School, as effectually to prevent their contaminating the other children — a thing almost impossible — *they would not attend*. The whole system of our good British schools is utterly unfitted for them, and would not be endured by them . . . while at a good Infant School, and a British School, in one of the worst localities of a large city, the bulk of the children are sent clean, neat and with tolerable regularity, even by parents

> in the lowest depths of poverty . . . in a Ragged School, distant but a few minutes' walk, the master asserts that there is scarcely a parent who takes the trouble to send the child to School . . . the regularity of attendance at the School, which is now considerable, is almost entirely owning to the interest in it excited in the children themselves.

And here, of course, lies the special contribution made by the ragged schools: they sought children that other institutions would not or could not seek. And yet, given their origins and the motivations of those who attempted to teach in them, a Sunday ragged school, is, wrote one of its historians, "more the product of instinct responding to necessity than of ingenuity seeking to solve social problems."[12]

In 1844, nineteen schools joined together to form the Ragged School Union, and Lord Shaftesbury, already known for his humanitarian efforts on behalf of liberalizing the child labor laws, was invited to become its first president. As one reared in the evangelical tradition, Shaftesbury attracted the attention and loyalty of Dissenters, and was able to focus their combined energies for many years to come, as the number of teachers rose from 200 in 1845 to a high of over 5,000 in 1894.[13] They came from all strata of society, though in the early days of the Union, much support originated with the aristocracy, who were able to attract large numbers of volunteers. Only the permanent teachers were paid, and with funds at a minimum, their qualifications were often questionable. General Gordon, founder of the Salvation Army, Quintin Hogg, founder of the Regent Street polytechnic, the first of such institutions, and Dr. Barnardo, founder of the famous homes for foundlings and, incidentally, organizer of the largest of all the child emigration schemes, served their apprenticeships in these schools. The growing interest and activity in the struggle for women's rights, particularly in the workplace, resulted in a large influx of women into the ragged schools, as, frustrated in their efforts to find employment in more conventional areas, they undertook this and similar tasks which can only be characterized as herculean. Those who taught boys appeared to have had an 'easier' time:

> I saw there [reported Lord Shaftesbury] thirty or forty men, none of them with shoes or stockings on, and some without shirts — the wildest and most awful looking men you can imagine. They all sat in a ring, and the only other human being in the room was a young woman of twenty-six or twenty-seven years of age, and, allow me to add, one of the prettiest women I ever saw. She was teaching all these wild, rough, uncouth creatures who never bowed the head to any constable or any form of civil authority, yet they looked on her with a degree of reverence and affection that amounted to adoration.[14]

The earliest attempts of the ragged school organizers was to work with children in the name of religion. A consequence of deliberate policy rather than basic conviction, they realized full well that to have attempted to recruit children in the name of *education* would have caused wide-

spread 'alarm': Education, it was widely thought, was more dangerous than ignorance.[15] Nevertheless, whatever the label, there was a perceived need for 'alternative' schooling for those for whom existing institutions held no attraction. In addition, changing social and political conditions were making the safety of children more necessary. For example, from 1840, the indenturing of child chimney sweeps was forbidden by law, which meant that masters had to recruit those small boys who roamed the streets and whom no one cared to protect.[16] Ragged schools were one of the few institutions to seek out such children and offer them safe haven.

In the early days, schools were held in barns, cowsheds, stables, covered-in railway arches, disused store-rooms or workmen's cottages. Later, buildings and other suitable facilities were rented or, in cases where public subscriptions were sufficient, built to specification.

The original Sunday school gave rise in the 1840s to weekday schools, regarded by the managers as preventative for young children, and also to evening schools, reformatory for older pupils.[17] By 1870 nearly half the children in the day schools were under six years of age, and nearly all were under ten.[18]

Although the schools may have differed in character one from another, most taught reading, writing, and sometimes history and geography. But all shared a common curriculum inasmuch as the Bible was an obligatory and vital component, for the main object of the enterprise was to "teach the children of the lowest poor to read the word of God, and to understand its simple truths."[19] Mary Carpenter had been among critics who had accused the movement of perpetuating and contributing to the very raggedness with which it was daily confronted. "You are," she declared, "increasing the spirit of dependence . . . you are conferring a bonus on vice."[20] Her criticism did not go unheeded by the Ragged School Union. Before it had celebrated its fiftieth anniversary, industrial schools had replaced many of the original Sunday school-oriented classes, with religious teachings only one component of a curriculum designed to strengthen what would today be called career skills, in addition to moral fiber.[21]

A brief description has already been given of a ragged school class session. Such descriptions may be multipled by the hundreds, but all of them illuminate the main characteristics of these unique schoolrooms, spontaneity! Shaftesbury was nothing if not genuinely committed to the education of the children and learned early in his association with them that certain principles were axiomatic:

> Authority [the teacher] cannot exercise; the children may be coaxed, but they cannot be coerced; fines it would be absurd to think of; beating would not be efficacious, nor indeed safe; expulsion is no punishment.

[The pupils] must come when they like, or they will not come at all.[22]

The various challenges that are inherent in these findings are obvious, and clearly indicate the nature of the task undertaken by Shaftesbury's people, and in no small measure point to the caliber of teacher they attempted to recruit.

By 1870, the number of buildings under the control of the Union rose to 196, from a mere 20 in 1845. Average attendance in the day schools increased from 3,480 in 1848 to 23,052; Sunday school from 5,843 to 29,778, and night school from 3,300 in 1848 to around 9,000 by 1870.[23]

Despite the modification in the curriculum over the years from predominantly moral to specifically vocational, street and slum nevertheless held their own fatal attraction even for those who had been fortified with tools of a trade and the word of God, for what hope exists for the youth's future, when, as Besant so succinctly puts it,

> the companies are criminals, the examples are evil, and the means of earning an honest living are denied.[24]

The high rate of 'recidivism' caused much concern to Shaftesbury, his associates and successors. Fortuitously, a solution appeared from across the channel in the guise of the 1848 revolutions which, together with the rise of Chartism at home and unrest in the cities caused in part by the ever-increasing numbers of Irish migrants, created a climate receptive to drastic social measures. Among such measures was the emigration of young children to the colonies, to 'Greater Britain.' This was not a new concept, emigration having already been adopted as a child saving scheme by several humanitarians including Edward Brenton and his Children's Friend Society, and Sydney Turner of the Philanthropic Society. In 1848, Shaftesbury moved in the House of Commons,

> That it is expedient that means be annually provided for the voluntary emigration to some of Her Majesty's colonies of a certain number of young persons of both sexes, who have been educated in the schools, ordinarily called the Ragged Schools, in and about the Metropolis.[25]

What was needed, he urged, was a different way of viewing child emigration:

> It will be something to have established a new system of colonization and no longer regarding it merely as the drainage of our goals or the outlet of the off-scouring of the feeble, the mischievous or the distressed, [but rather] to hold it up as an object of ambition, the recompense of moral exertion.[26]

He received a subsidy for one year only of 1,500 pounds, which amount was used to send 150 promising pupils — all boys — to New South Wales to start a new life. He was probably fortunate to receive any support at all. Many landed gentry approved of the Ragged School program, but were intensely critical of Shaftesbury for not settling the children in the rural areas of Britain . . . home colonization as it was called. Was it fair, asked a large segment of agrarian opinion, for emigration to be denied to industrious village lads, unless they fled to the towns, engaged in a little pilfering, and attended the Ragged School occasionally? Private donations were subsequently raised, enabling young boys, and later girls, fourteen years and older, to be sent first to Australia and then to Canada. Shaftesbury's qualifications for the young pupil-emigrant are revealing: sound health; regular attendance at school for six months; the ability to write a sentence from dictation; to work the four basic arithmetic rules; the ability to read fluently; to repeat the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments; certification of four months' attendance at an industrial class or proof of knowledge of a practical occupation.[27]

Children were encouraged to write of their experiences abroad for publication in the Union's magazine. These letters, interesting in their own right, also kept alive public interest in the emigration scheme and assured a steady flow of financial support. Children's experiences in Australia were mixed:

> The country is a beautiful place, and I have got a good master. I get ten shillings per week and board and lodgings for the first six months; after that I shall get I dare say double, as I am at present a shepherd. (1849)[28]

> I had to mind of a Sunday and I did not like it; besides it was such a lazy way of life. I did not like it so I left and they would not pay my wages which was three pounds so I had no money. They were such bad people at the farm . . . (1851)[29]

These letters are a part of what is currently being discovered to be an extensive collection, written over a one hundred year span by children from around the world back home to their sending-out agencies. They convey the sense of pathos and tragedy, despite the moments of elation and triumph, which underscores the entire phenomenon of child emigration, and the movement's commendable humanitarian, child-saving motives.

Never entirely free from criticism, whether spawned by the religious auspices or the pathetic state of the pupils themselves, ragged schools were, in 1861 the target of a report of the Educational Commissioners which was considered by Shaftesbury and his associates to call into serious question the schools' progress and activities. Focusing their opposition in the House of Commons, a petition was obtained to conduct

an inquiry into "how the education of destitute and neglected children may be most efficiently and economically assisted by public funds," as an alternative, in effect, to the then present voluntary effort. The vindication was clear:

> . . . ragged schools appear by the evidence to be well organized, and to be carried on with much zeal and discretion, and to be calculated to effect a great deal of good.[30]

And the report's final recommendation, addressing the question of public funding, declared:

> That ragged schools should be left to the missionary exertions of the ragged school managers, without any interference by the Government further than had already existed.[31]

By the 1890s, twenty years after passage of the National Education Act, the Ragged School Union's focus had shifted from schooling *per se* to a larger, more comprehensive definition of charity work. For once elementary education had been made compulsory in 1876, and all fees had been abolished in Board schools in 1881, the need for the ragged school declined rapidly. In its place, missions, religious agencies, clothing agencies working through elementary schools located in the worst slums of the city, Fresh-Air Funds, all these opened and expanded.

A direct descendant, in fact a continuation of the Union, was the Shaftesbury Society, incorporated in 1904, which maintained both boys' and girls' homes in the south of England. Its declared object was "to care for, maintain and educate children in want of good homes, upbringing, maintenance or educational facilities, and in need of financial assistance to enable them to secure one or more of such advantages."[32] The Society and the homes are still in existence.

A former ragged school teacher himself and hardly a dispassionate voice in this area of endeavor, Dr. Thomas Barnardo expressed in 1893 what was certainly not a minority view regarding the contributions of the Union:

> It has been patronized, then ignored, then criticized, then tolerated, but now it is being imitated . . . I say that the Education Act of 1870, which has been extended into the great boon of free education, is due to the ragged schools, and is indeed but an extension of the ragged day schools . . . now free education lies at the door of every child but [the Union] pointed the way and carried it out into the slums and back courts. [It] showed what loving, wise teaching could do . . .[33]

Even the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, Barnardo declared, owed its origin to the movement, thus,

every ragged school carried on with energy and success was really as a matter of fact a society for the prevention of cruelty to children.[34]

One could not, perhaps, find a more appropriate epitaph for this very special and significant movement in the history of education: "A society for the prevention of cruelty to children." When, once again, the ragged school is viewed in the greater social context — which, of course, it has to be if its true contribution is to be fairly assessed — the role it played for three or four decades takes on proper proportions. To be identified by history as a movement or phenomenon that enabled thousands of children to survive at a time when survival would otherwise have been highly problematic, is surely to be assured a permanent place in that history. In addition, to have assisted children not merely to survive their destitution but to rise above and beyond it — literally, in the case of those who were sent overseas — is to confer upon Shaftesbury and thousands of teachers and supporters the recognition that has not always been theirs. Let Shaftesbury, appropriately, have the final word:

> We are often met with the interrogatory — 'What will you do with these children when you have educated them?' . . . 'What will you do with them, if you neglect to educate them?' They are not soap-bubbles, or peach-blossoms, — things that can be puffed away by the breath of a suckling: they are the seeds of future generations; and the wheat or tares will predominate, as Christian principle or ignorant selfishness shall, hereafter, govern our conduct. We must cease, if we would be safe, to trust in measures of coercion and chastisement for our juvenile vagrants; they are not too many to be educated as infants; they are far too many to be punished as adults. We must entertain higher thoughts for them and for England — and, with a just appreciation of their rights, and our own duties, not only help them, by God's blessing, from these depths of degradation, but raise them to a level on which they may run the course that is set before them, as citizens of the British Empire, and heirs of a glorious immortality.[35]

Notes

[1] See, e.g., *The Illustrated London News*, December 8, 1849, p. 32.

[2] C.J. Montague, *Sixty Years in Waifdom*. New York: Augustus M. Kelley Publishers, 1969 (1st edition, 1904), p. 34.

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] E.A.G. Clark, "The Early Ragged Schools and the Foundation of the Ragged School Union," *Journal of Education and History*, (University of Leeds), Vol. 1 #2, 1969, pp. 11-12.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 12.

[6] Walter Besant. "The Ragged School Union." *Contemporary Review*, Vol. 65, May, 1894, pp. 696-697.

[7] *The Illustrated London News*, September 22, 1849, p. 194.

[8] Raymond G. Cowherd. *The Politics of English Dissent*. New York, New York University Press, 1956, p. 42.

[9] *Ibid*, p. 43.

[10] *Ibid*, p. 119.

[11] Mary Carpenter. *Reformatory Schools*. London, G. Gilpin, 1851, pp. 35-36.

[12] Montague. *op. cit.*, pp. 33-34.

[13] *Ibid*, p. 105.

[14] *Ibid*, p. 117.

[15] Besant. *op. cit.*, p. 700.

[16] Kellow Chesney. *The Victorian Underworld*. New York, Schocken Books, 1972, p. 56.

[17] Clark. *op. cit.*, p. 18.

[18] *Ibid*.

[19] *Ibid*.

[20] *Ibid*, p. 15.

[21] In his 'Jubilee Report' for the Ragged School Union, Walter Besant (*op. cit.*, p. 689) offered his view of the history of charity in "nine short chapters":

Chapter I. When we give a beggar a penny for the love of the Lord and because he is a beggar.

Chapter II. When we build and endow a house at which the beggar shall always receive a bed and a supper because he is a beggar.

Chapter III. When we fall into doubt, perceiving that the beggar multiplies exceedingly and will not work, but blackens all the highways, knowing that he will be received and relieved because he is a beggar.

Chapter IV. When, under the influence of this doubt, we begin to hang the beggar, drown the beggar, pillory the beggar, and flog the beggar, but continue to give him a penny because he is a beggar.

Chapter V. When we found almshouses for the aged, poorhouses for the broken-down, Bridewells, workhouses, casual wards, stocks and pillory for the sturdy wagrant, but give him a penny on the road, because he is a beggar.

Chapter VI. When we pass Acts of Parliament for the suppression of the beggar, but continue to give him a penny, because he is a beggar.

Chapter VII. When we send cheques or help the beggar, because he is a beggar.

Chapter VIII. When we resolve to assist none but the deserving — viz., those who cannot work, or have fallen into unmerited misfortune. Yet we go on giving a penny to the beggar because he is a beggar.

Chapter IX. When we give no more cheques and no more casual doles, but in their place substitute personal service. That is to say, when we go among the class that breeds the beggar, and, by educating him, leading him, giving him a craft, and inspiring him with self-respect, prevent him from becoming a beggar.

[22] Lord Shaftesbury. "The Second Annual Report of the Ragged School Union." *The Quarterly Review*, Vol. LXXIX, December, 1846, p. 137.

[23] Clark. *op. cit.*, p. 19.

[24] Besant. *op. cit.*, p. 70.

[25] Quoted in Ivy Pinchbeck and Margaret Hewitt, *Children in English Society (Volume II)*. London. Rowtledge & Kegan Paul, 1973, p. 557.

[26] *Ibid.* pp. 556-558.

[27] Georgina Battiscombe. *Shaftesbury: The Great Reformer*. Boston. Houghton Mifflin Co., 1975, p. 205.

[28] Gillian Wagner. *Children of the Empire*. London. Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1982, p. 32.

[29] *Ibid.* p. 33.

[30] Montague. *op. cit.*, pp. 280-281.

[31] *Ibid.* p. 281.

[32] *Charities Digest* (Publication of the Family Welfare Association). London. Butterworths, 1973, p. 201.

[33] *Ibid.* pp. 241-242.

[34] *Ibid.* p. 242.

[35] Shaftesbury. *op. cit.*, p. 141.

GOING TO SCHOOL IN EARLY NINETEENTH-CENTURY NAPLES: THE YOUTH OF FRANCESCO DE SANCTIS

Charles R. Wolf
The Spencer Foundation,
Chicago

Although it is undoubtedly necessary for historians to deal with large masses of data from various sources pertinent to entire nations, major social institutions, and lengthy time periods, such history can lead us eventually to a sense of being overwhelmed by lifeless facts and inferences. At such times, we turn with relief to the autobiography of a Benjamin Franklin or the personal papers of a Thomas Jefferson to allow us to see a people, an institution, or a time through the eyes of an able witness; and in these personal reflections, we gather how the subject matter of history might have seemed to a contemporary observer. Material of this kind, when it is readable and intelligently written, is an invaluable source.[1] For those interested in European educational history, and particularly in Italian education in the nineteenth century, there is hardly a more engaging record than the book of memoirs by Francesco De Sanctis posthumously entitled *La Giovinezza (Youth)*.

The Educational Situation in Old Naples

Bourbon Naples, where De Sanctis was educated between the years 1826 and 1839, was a place of interrupted progress and slow ferment. After a period of Illuminist enthusiasm for popular education in the mid-eighteenth century, reaction had set in, allowing education in the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies to fall into "disastrous conditions."[2] The rule of Joseph Bonaparte in the first decade of the nineteenth century had brought notable reforms, including the institution of royal (state) secondary schools, elementary schools for both sexes in every center of population, and a public education office in the Ministry of the Interior. The brief rule of Murat had resulted in even more reforms, including a state teacher training program, state approval of teacher selection, compulsory education in the primary grades, and a uniform elementary curriculum. With the Bourbon restoration in 1815, these developments were suppressed, but a liberal uprising in 1820 had once again raised the issue of public education under state control. By the time De Sanctis started to attend school in 1826, the absolute monarchy was once again in control, and public education was a matter for royal mistrust. The schools of that period were mainly private or church-operated, and the clergy did much of the teaching.

Yet it appears that Naples was not entirely an educational backwash. There was, of course, the proud old University of Naples, dating from 1224, the fourth-oldest university in Italy.[3] There were also some able teachers, as De Sanctis records, and some modern thinkers among them. The picture that emerges from De Sanctis' memoirs is that of an educational patchwork, reflecting a society in transition. Into this mixed educational milieu came the boy who would grow into one of the great men of Italy's early national period.

De Sanctis' Childhood and Early Youth

Francesco De Sanctis was born in 1817 and spent his first years in his ancestral village — Morra Irpino, now called Morra De Sanctis, in Avellino Province. The matriarch of the family was De Sanctis' paternal grandmother, who had four sons: Carlo, Alessandro, Giuseppe, and Pietro. Two were priests and two were laymen. De Sanctis' father, Alessandro, had remained at home to supervise the family land; Carlo, a priest, was the eldest brother, and he kept school in Naples; Giuseppe Maria, also a priest, had been exiled by the King of Naples, Francesco I, for his part in the anti-Bourbon uprisings of 1820-1821; Pietro, the other layman, was in exile with Giuseppe in Rome. Pietro's son, Giovanni, was about the same age as young Francesco; he remained in Morra Irpino and was Francesco's closest childhood companion.[4] In the account in *La Giovinezza*, De Sanctis says little about his mother.

Evidently, De Sanctis was a rather withdrawn, bookish child; the other household children thought him "stupid" because he preferred sitting in a corner with a book to joining in their raucous games. He does not explain who taught him to read or how, but he does mention the fact that he attended a village school where he learned to "decline and conjugate."[5]

De Sanctis' true formal education began when he was nine years old. At that time, his grandmother took him and Giovanni, his cousin, to Naples in order to enroll them in their uncle's school. Like many clerics of his time, Carlo De Sanctis had put aside his priestly duties and had taken up teaching as his primary profession. The school and Uncle Carlo's quarters were located on the third floor of an apartment building at Via Formale, 24. The apartment had two entrances: one at the left for the students, and one at the right for the family. The school door led into a corridor upon which three rooms opened. Uncle Carlo had two assistants who taught in the side rooms, while he held forth in the great room at the end. It was in this school and this household that Francesco De Sanctis spent the years 1826 to 1831.

Perhaps De Sanctis' experience of attending his uncle's school was atypical; surely, few boys of that time were related to a headmaster, with whatever privileges that status might have conferred. Furthermore,

young De Sanctis was an able and eager student who read more than was required. Nevertheless, in these clear and most readable reminiscences, De Sanctis tells us something of what that school was like.

Uncle Carlo called his school a "literary" school; thus it was one type of school among several extant in old Naples. The complete program lasted five years, and as one might expect, it was heavily literary in content. The curriculum included grammar, rhetoric, poetry, history, chronology (sic), mythology, and Roman and Greek classics. These courses were taught in the grand hall by Uncle Carlo himself. The assistants taught arithmetic, church history, and drawing; they used the lesser rooms. De Sanctis describes the instruction as "traditional." There were standard authors to read, and selected passages in rhetoric, grammar, history, geography, and mythology. Some of these were in manuscript form, prepared by Uncle Carlo; others were books written by earlier teachers, such as a Latin grammar in verse compiled by French monks in Port-Royal in the 1600's.

The school had both day students and boarders, but there were few of the latter because of the difficulty of housing them. (De Sanctis does not record how many students attended the school.) There was a familiar attrition pattern, with more students enrolled in the first two years than in the latter three. During lessons, students from all five classes sat in the same room; the first two, because they were more populous, sat in the middle, while the others sat at the sides. Carlo taught all of the classes by turns.

> He began with the correction of written work, then there was grammatical analysis and explication of Latin texts, and finally the reciting of memorized grammar, stories, and poetry.[6]

In fact, most of the instruction involved memorization and recitation in good Scholastic fashion; De Sanctis mentions having memorized much of Virgil, Livy, Horace, and others while he was at Uncle Carlo's school.

The heavily classical curriculum included such authors as Cornelius, Phaedrus, Thucydides, and Tacitus. Among the more current books were the aforementioned Port-Royal Grammar; an Italian grammar by Father Soave (1743-1806); a Rhetoric by Ignazio Falconieri (1755-1799); the epic poem *Jerusalem Liberated* by Renaissance poet Torquato Tasso (1544-1595); and Italian translations of classical histories by Oliver Goldsmith. Although Uncle Carlo tried to keep his boys on a set curriculum, Francesco and his cousin took great delight in secret extracurricular reading in their room. They sampled the *Adventures of Telemachus*, portions of Walter Scott's *Kenilworth*, "Night Thoughts" by the English poet Edward Young (1683-1765), tragedies by Voltaire, a tragedy called "Sofonisba" by Gian Giorgio Trissini (1478-1550), and much other material of a romantic and adventurous sort. De Sanctis confesses to

having been something of a daydreamer who spent hours or even days acting out some literary fantasy, only to have the spell broken when he was rebuked sharply by one of the adults.

Life in Uncle Carlo's home was pleasant enough: young Francesco had the company of his cousin and of the occasional boarding-student. Carlo, as a priest living in town, needed the services of a housekeeper, and this role was played by another relative, Aunt Marianna, who lived nearby. Francesco and his cousin much enjoyed the company of this aunt, who went walking with the boys and spoke to them in a pure Neapolitan dialect. She also supervised the kitchen, and with the help of a servant woman provided plentiful plain but good food for Carlo and the other residents. De Sanctis tells a delightful tale of stealing fresh bread from the kitchen one night, perhaps demonstrating something of the universality of schoolboy pranks.

The Secondary Education of De Sanctis

When De Sanctis completed his studies at Uncle Carlo's school in 1831, the family had already decided to continue his education; it was up to Uncle Carlo to choose a suitable secondary school for his nephew. Fortunately, for a boy of Francesco's class, there was no lack of secondary education to be had, even if the curricular choices were somewhat limited. As De Sanctis observes,

> This was the golden age of independent teaching. A man in any discipline began his career by opening a school. The seminaries were schools of Latin and philosophy. The government schools were run by monks. The form of instruction was still Scholastic. Rhetoric and philosophy were written in that conventional Latin that really belonged to the Scholastics. The sciences were neglected, as was the national language. Nevertheless a little of the (illuminist) eighteenth century had penetrated those dark theological shadows, and in a curious match, one saw sense-realism and Scholasticism walking arm-in-arm.[7]

Yet even in this time, things were changing; for, as De Sanctis further points out,

> In the schools of Naples there was greater progress in curriculum. Latin was passing out of fashion; one wrote on Scholastic subjects in an incorrect but clear and easy Italian. The authors were almost all abbes, such as Abbe Genovesi, Father Soave, Abbe Troisi.[8]

Uncle Carlo's first choice of school for Francesco turned out to be a poor one. He attempted to have Francesco accepted by a Jesuit institution for which the boy was not well-prepared, either academically or psychologically. De Sanctis writes of a terrifying interview in a small, dark, dusty room, where two somber priests, one standing and one seated at a desk, scrutinized him mercilessly. The standing priest asked questions

and the sitting priest took notes. Francesco, who was never particularly strong in Latin, failed at the task of translating a literary passage from Italian into Latin. Uncle Carlo's rote method of teaching had not prepared him for that. The boy was informed that he would not be accepted by the Jesuit school, not even in the elementary division.

Carlo then decided to send both nephews to a secondary school kept by the Abbe Lorenzo Fazzini (1787-1837). Fazzini, inactive as a clergyman, was known chiefly for his work in physics and mathematics. De Sanctis recalls him in these words:

> Then Abbe Fazzini was much in vogue. This elegant priest who had taken off his cassock and collar and wore a suit and a black tie was a sense-realist of the last century, but he pretended to reconcile those doctrines with his religious principles. He spoke agitatedly against innate ideas and pre-established harmonies, and he often concluded: "Nothing is in the intellect that has not been through the senses." But he also wore himself out in demonstrating the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, and revelation.[9]

Fazzini had a schoolroom in his home. It was a large room, longer than it was wide, and it sometimes accommodated 400 boys. The Abbe's program of studies was designed to take three years, but a bright student might finish in two. Fazzini proved to be a kindly and affectionate teacher who encouraged his boys and often gave them candied almonds to eat.

The curriculum of Fazzini's school was quite different from the typical fare of the Jesuits, and for that matter, his assigned texts were different from the "worm-eaten and moldy" books, mostly of Scholastic origin, which Uncle Carlo had used at his school.[10] The principal text which Fazzini used was the *Logic and Metaphysics* of Abbe Troisi, a book full of arguments, theorems, problems, postulates and corollaries, syllogisms, enthymemes, and dilemmas. Young De Sanctis devoured it eagerly, and he claims it made him a "dry and formidable" debater.[11] With the encouragement of his new teacher, De Sanctis read Enlightenment authors: Locke, Condillac, Destutt de Tracy, Helvetius, Bonnet, La Mettrie, Voltaire, Diderot, Rousseau; and then English empiricists, sense-realists, and materialists. With his usual enthusiasm, De Sanctis read these authors avidly, grasping little at first, but eventually taking time to ponder their meanings. Fazzini recommended works by J.J. Burlamaqui (1694-1748) and H. Ahrens (1808-1874), both theorists of natural law; and the Abbe advocated the views of Montesquieu on mixed government.

Unlike Uncle Carlo, the Abbe Fazzini taught science seriously. There was a text in experimental physics by Giuseppe Saverio Poli (1746-1825), whose contents opened a "new world" in young Francesco's mind.[12] Fazzini had a science cabinet which he used to demonstrate the principles of air, light, and electricity. De Sanctis, in his usual

poetic way, reports his feeling that the electric sparks of the demonstrations ran through his bones.[13]

The only subject which De Sanctis could not penetrate was mathematics, whose abstract lines and numbers meant nothing to him, and whose proofs he had to learn by rote because he could not understand the examples which the Abbe drew on the blackboard. Perhaps it was the fault of the teaching method: The teacher went too quickly, and only repeated what was in the textbook. More probably, even then, De Sanctis was leaning toward a career in literature and philosophy. Despite his ineptitude for mathematics, De Sanctis seems to have learned much from the Abbe Fazzini that informed his later life and work.

Alternative Higher Education

De Sanctis admits that his formal education was of words and arguments rather than of things; but his youthful life was not entirely wound up in abstractions and verbalisms. Toward the end of secondary school, De Sanctis and his companions enrolled in private singing and dancing classes, studied the piano, and endeavored to learn French; in Francesco's case, this was all with the blessing of Uncle Carlo, who certainly expected his nephew to occupy a station in society where these skills would be desirable. At times, the boys also went out together to drink wine and eat pizza!

About this time, De Sanctis thought of going to the University, but his uncle dissuaded him on the grounds that too much study had made him thin and pale; instead, the studious youth was sent back to his native village to spend some months in the healthful rural air. When he returned to Naples to continue his education, Uncle Carlo arranged for him to study law in private classes held by another laicized cleric, Brother Garzia.

The law school, such as it was, was held in a small, dirty room in Via Porta Medina. About twenty students attended class sessions in that room. Garzia was a congenial teacher who sat among his students and discussed and debated with them. His ideas were old fashioned, but his teaching method was not. In Brother Garzia's class, anyone might speak out to answer a question; and if the respondent gave an incorrect answer, rather than receiving a rebuke, he received a look of pity. In this class, De Sanctis read the Civil Code and other legal documents, and the teacher encouraged him to study eighteenth-century French jurists.

De Sanctis' legal studies were eventually interrupted by his discovery of the outstanding intellectual salon of Naples in the 1830's. A classmate led him to the literary "studio" of the Marchese Basilio Puoti (1782-1847). The Marchese was an erudite man who held evening classes for the intelligentsia of Naples; young nobles also attended these

sessions, which were held in a room in Puoti's palatial home. Although Naples was still under Bourbon rule, this seemingly innocent activity had undertones of nationalism, for the Marchese taught his guests Renaissance Italian literature exclusively, concentrating on what he considered the purest examples of the literary language. De Sanctis later wrote an essay about this remarkable teacher in which he called the Marchese "The Last Purist."[14]

At the evening sessions, the Marchese critiqued passages from Italian authors of the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries, commenting on vocabulary, grammar, and style. One of his assistants would then read aloud from a work being studied by the group. The material was new to De Sanctis, and it contradicted his previous notions of style that he had gained by reading eighteenth and nineteenth-century authors. Soon, Francesco had developed an appreciation for the more antique style, and he had managed to distinguish himself in the eyes of the Marchese. He passed into that group of young men that was called the "elect," (the Marchese's favorites), and he became a kind of assistant to Puoti. De Sanctis was allowed to attend the more informal morning sessions that were held at the Marchese's residence, and his new mentor encouraged him to do some writing on his own, keeping to the "pure" Italian style: "One learns to write by writing," the Marchese is said to have remarked, rather unoriginally.[15] De Sanctis' enthusiasm for these activities led him to abandon his law studies and other interests.

This idyllic period in De Sanctis' life came to an end in 1834 or 1835, when Uncle Carlo suffered a stroke and could no longer teach. For a time, young Francesco shared the teaching duties with the two other teachers and performed many of the tasks of running his uncle's school. He managed, however, to continue attending the Marchese's sessions whenever possible, and the mentoring relationship continued. Puoti sent students to De Sanctis for private tutoring, and in 1839 and 1841, the Marchese's influence was helpful in obtaining teaching positions for De Sanctis at military schools. Although Puoti's "studio" was not a school or a university, and it assigned no grades and granted no degrees, as an experience in higher education it was invaluable to young De Sanctis.

It would be impossible to catalogue the activities and achievements of De Sanctis in a small space. Most of what he studied and experienced in his youth seems to have borne fruit in his multiple careers. His teaching and philosophizing led him into politics and lawmaking; his refined writing style gave him finesse as an author and credibility as a literary critic. Ideologically, he combined elements of nationalism and republicanism with a historicism derived from his readings of Leibnitz and Hegel, to which was added a kind of democratic Catholicism and an appreciation for positive science. The origins of these predilections are not difficult to detect in the pages of *La Giovinezza*.

One might object that De Sanctis was an extraordinary man and the education he describes is not typical or not that of the average nineteenth-century Neapolitan. With such a varied educational scene in Bourbon Naples, it would be difficult at this remove to determine what was typical or ordinary. A resort to numerical description might be helpful (if one could be sure of its accuracy); but no tallies can give us glimpses into those dark and musty Neapolitan classrooms in De Sanctis' accounts, rooms where some light occasionally entered. What De Sanctis saw was not unique to him; surely others experienced much the same, whether or not they reacted as he did. In any event, there was enough new thought in those rooms to enlighten one who became a leading thinker of a modern European nation. In the words of Professor Visalberghi, De Sanctis' was "the mind which had the clearest awareness of the totality of educational problems posed by the achievement of national unification."[15]

Notes

[1] Cf. Geraldine J. Clifford, "Saints, Sinners, and People: A Position Paper on the Historiography of American Education," *History of Education Quarterly*, Fall 1975.

[2] Enzo Robaud, *Disegno storico della scuola italiana* (Florence: Felice Le Monnier, 1961, p. 11.)

[3] Burton R. Clark, *Academic Power in Italy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977, pp. 9 and 17.)

[4] Gilberto Finzi, "La vita," preface to Francesco De Sanctis, *La Giovinezza* (Milan: Garzanti Editore, 1981, pp. vii-viii.)

[5] De Sanctis, p. 4.

[6] De Sanctis, p. 7.

[7] De Sanctis, p. 24.

[8] De Sanctis, p. 25.

[9] De Sanctis, p. 25.

[10] De Sanctis, p. 26.

[11] De Sanctis, p. 26.

[12] De Sanctis, p. 27.

[13] De Sanctis, p. 28.

[14] Finzi, p. vii.

[15] De Sanctis, p. 49.

[16] Nicola Abbagnano and Aldo Visalberghi, *Linee di storia della pedagogia* (Turin: G.B. Paravia & C., III, p. 172.)

Part II
Varieties of Quantitative History

THE COST OF RURAL SCHOOLING IN ILLINOIS IN 1902

William Eaton
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale

Illinois passed its common school law in 1855. The number of small rural schools that were developed following the passage were great in number as the entire state reached the high water mark of over 12,000 separately ordained school districts by 1902 with the greater number of these being single teacher, one-room school districts. Originally, the creation of such school districts was looked upon as a wonderful sign of progress. By 1902, though, the great number of small rural districts were looked upon by the schoolmen in less complimentary terms.

The complaints of the schoolmen against the rural schools were several. They objected to the facilities, they criticized the curriculum, they disliked the ungraded nature of the classes, they railed against the lack of pedagogical training received by the teachers, and they deplored the lack of administration and supervision employed in the rural settings.

The facilities were sub-standard. Some of the structures were cast-off farm buildings given by local citizens for the use of the school. A few of these were even log buildings generally condemned for their lack of paned windows and protection against the wind and rain. State Superintendent Alfred Bayliss reported seventeen such structures in his annual report of 1902.[1] Other schoolhouses were locally built by the patrons with donated roughsawn lumber and few amenities. The toilet facilities were usually privies set over slit trenches. The interiors featured poor ventilation, too little of the necessary natural light, no chalkboards, and backless benches for the scholars to sit upon. Playgrounds were non-existent.

The curriculum in such schools was seldom more than the "readin', ritin', and 'rithmetic" that characterized the schools throughout the previous century. What the schoolmen wanted was for the schools to adopt the "State Course of Study." The State Course had been designed by experts who had made every effort to include everything known at that time to be pedagogically sound. These rural schools were also lacking in the use of instructional apparatus. Maps, charts, models, microscopes, and other such equipment were unknown. School libraries and reference materials were also uncommon.

School enrollment was small so that the schools were ungraded. The State Superintendent reported that of the state's 12,855 schoolhouses, only 2,151 were graded.[2] All of the students in grades one through eight sat in the same room, heard the same recitations, and often used the same

books.

Most of the teachers in such schools were untrained. Many were only eighth grade graduates who simply repeated the eighth grade as a way of preparing for the oral examination given by the county superintendent of schools. Passing such an examination and then promising to attend the four or five day county teacher institute held every fall in the county seat was enough to earn a certificate to teach.

Such teachers worked without supervision. Once hired by the three person board of school trustees, the teacher was turned loose to practice his trade with no other victim than to keep the children under control. The county superintendent was to visit each school under his, or in a few cases her, jurisdiction on an annual basis. The reports of the county superintendents reveal their failure to do so. Many of the rural schools were unaccessable by cart or carriage. If a superintendent were unwilling to travel by horseback or to walk great distances, certain schools did not get visited. The Superintendent's report of 1902 showed that 1,229 of the state's schools had not been visited.[3]

The answer, believed the schoolmen, was school consolidation. Close the small schools, send the children to larger schools where they would have good facilities, the state course of study, trained teachers, and principal teachers and superintendents. This did not happen. State legislators dragged their feet on forcing consolidation since many of their constituencies were rural. The people themselves objected to losing their schools which were the object of personal memories and the symbols of community. Most importantly, there was a physical impediment to school consolidation. Country roads were not paved nor would they be paved until the 1940s. Such roads would not bear the weight of horse drawn hacks loaded down with children. Even a small rain would mire loaded wagons to the axle. The introduction of motorized school buses in later decades could not overcome the lack of paving. By 1947, Illinois still had over 10,000 separate school districts.

Modern usage aside, the word "cheap" had positive connotations in 1902. People prided themselves on doing things cheaply. "Putting up" vegetables and fruits was more than just a guarantee of quality, it was like money in the bank. Buying clothes that were durable rather than stylish that would last several seasons was smart. Avoiding frills, "making do," and getting by with little money were virtues. This same philosophy extended to the operation of the schools. The school trustees, usually cash-poor farmers, could squeeze a school budget until it cried. Actually, it was the schoolmen who were crying. Said O.J. Kern, County Superintendent of Winnebago County: "The best teacher is handicapped in an uncomfortable, poorly ventilated school room without maps, globe, dictionary, or a small library, with the irregular attendance of the children because of weather, bad roads, or indifference of parents."[4]

Records of the times show that schools could be built for next to nothing and operated annually at extremely modest cost. To give the reader some idea of just how inexpensively schools could be built and then maintained, the following charts should be examined. In organizing these charts, the research was designed to place rural schools in three categories: cheap, moderate, and expensive. In calculating costs the researcher made use of local newspapers of the era, township school records, state educational journals, the Biennial Reports of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction for the State of Illinois, and, most importantly, the 1902 Sears-Roebuck Catalog. When in doubt, the Sears-Roebuck Catalog became the arbiter of what costs might be at a local level. They carried nearly everything that a school might need.

The Costs of Rural Schools in Illinois, 1902

— Cheap School —

Non-Recurring (Building)	
Schoolhouse (includes land)	0
Heating plant (wood burner)	$4.15
Desks (home made benches)	0
Teacher's desk (home made)	0
Chair	$2.50
Chalkboard (none)	0
American flag	$1.25
Water supply (bucket and dipper)	.23
Clock (Waterbury school clock)	$3.25
Bell (none, teacher used voice)	0
Pictures (none)	
Apparatus	
Globe (none)	0
Microscope (none)	0
Compasses (none)	0
Books	
Dictionary	$5.00
Encyclopedia (none)	0
Atlas (none)	0
Childrens' books (none)	0
Scissors	.97
Sports equipment	
Basketball and goal (none)	0
Baseball (none)	0
Baseball bat (none)	0
Broom and dust pan	.56
Bookcase (for odds and ends)	$6.95
Recurring (Operational)	
Teacher's salary (male for 6 mos.)	$75.00
Janitorial (teacher)	0
Fuel (donated green wood)	0
Ink (3 gallons)	$1.25
Penholders (40 @ .05)	$2.00
Erasers (40 @ .04)	$1.60
Blank ledger	$1.15
Glue (one quart)	.56
Pen nibs (one-half gross)	.28
Towels (3)	.25
Total Non-Recurring	$24.86
Total Recurring	$82.09

Non-recurring (Building)	
Schoolhouse (wood frame)	$1200.00
Heating plant (coal stove)	$11.25
Desks (for 40, 20 two seaters)	$200.00
Teacher's desk	$25.00
Chair	$2.50
Chalkboard ("blackened board")	0
American flag	$1.25
Water supply (pump & cistern figured into building cost)	
bucket and dipper	$1.25
Clock (Waterbury)	$3.25
Bell (hand bell)	$1.48
Pictures (one of Lincoln)	$4.00
Apparatus	
Globe	$2.00
Microscope	$13.75
Compasses (40 @ .04)	$1.60
Books	
Dictionary	$5.00
Encyclopedia (Chambers, 15 vols)	$5.95
Atlas (Imperial)	$1.35
Childrens' books (61 @ .50)	$30.50
Scissors	.97
Sports equipment	
Basketball and goal	$6.25
Baseball	.45
Baseball bat	.20
Broom and dust pan	.56
Bookcase	$6.95
Recurring (Operational)	
Teacher's salary (male for 6 mos.)	$387.30
Janitorial ($5.00 a week)	$50.00
Fuel (coal for season)	$50.00
Ink (3 gal.)	$2.00
Penholders (40 @ .05)	$2.00
Erasers (40 @ .04)	$1.60
Blank ledger	$1.25
Glue (one quart)	.56
Pen nibs (one-half gross)	.28
Towels (3)	.25
Total Non-Recurring	$1525.51
Total Recurring	$495.24

— *Expensive School* —

Non-Recurring (Building)	
Schoolhouse (brick)	$2000.00
Heating plant (coal furnace)	$79.20
Desks (40 individual)	$320.00
Teacher's desk	$25.00
Chair	$2.50
Chalkboard (slate)	$10.00
American flag	$1.25
Water supply (pump, cistern, bubbling fountain part of schoolhouse cost)	0
Clock (Waterbury)	$3.25
Bell (for hanging in belfry)	$18.00
Pictures (2)	$8.00
Apparatus	
Globe	$2.00
Microscope	$13.75
Compasses (40 @ .04)	$1.60
Books	
Dictionary	$5.00
Encyclopedia (Chambers, 15 vol)	$5.95
Atlas (Imperial)	$1.35
Childrens' books (112 @ .50)	$61.00
Scissors	.97
Sports equipment	
Basketball and goal	$6.25
Baseball	.45
Baseball bat	.20
Broom and dust pan	.56
Bookcase	$6.95
Recurring (Operational)	
Teacher's salary (male for 6 mos.)	$1200.00
Janitorial ($10 a week)	$240.00
Fuel (coal for season)	$100.00
Ink (3 gal.)	$1.25
Penholders (40 @ .05)	$2.00
Erasers (40 @ .04)	$1.60
Blank ledger	$1.25
Glue (1 quart)	.56
Pen nibs (one-half gross)	.28
Towels (3)	.25
Total Non-Recurring	$2573.23
Total Recurring	$1547.19

A note or two about how these costs were derived is in order. Most of the permanent equipment and disposable commodity prices were based on the 1902 Sears-Roebuck Catalog exclusive of shipping charges.[5] The assumption is that goods of a similar cost and quality could be purchased locally or ordered through suppliers. The figure on the cost of childrens' books was arrived at by using figures tabulated by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction who said in his 1902 report that the average number of volumes in school libraries was 112.[6] This figure was used for the "expensive" school and cut in half for the "moderate school." The Superintendent reported that only 6,477 districts, about half, even had libraries. Teacher salary figures were also taken from the Superintendent's report when he stated that the lowest salaries in the state were $12.50 per month for males and $10.00 for females. In the same tabulation he reported the highest figures to be $300.00 per month for males and $275.00 for females.[7] These upper figures would be too high for rural schools so they were arbitrarily pared down to the $200.00 a month figure. The average salary in the state was the $64.55 a month that was used in calculating the teacher cost for the "moderate" school. The average cost for a female teacher was $54.18.

Whether to provide data based upon male teachers or female teachers was another decision faced by the author. Men were still preferred but increasingly difficult to hire for the amounts trustees were willing to pay. When the school year had been shorter, a farmer could teach school. Women worked for 20 to 25 percent less than men. This explains why women came to dominate the profession. The author has, nonetheless, given figures for male teachers.

Teachers were incredibly young. J. Rollo Black, County Superintendent for Schuyler County, reported to the State Superintendent that: "The average age of our teachers is 22½ years and the average experience in teaching is a little more than 20 months."[8] Clearly, the pattern was for people to drop into teaching briefly and then drop out. Men moved on to more lucrative positions. Women teachers were thought to make desirable wives and mothers and were eagerly sought after by area farmers.

The school term varied in Illinois in 1902. Six months was a minimum figure widely used in the rural districts. Some of the city schools were operating on an eight or nine month school year. Obviously, the schoolmen preferred the longer term. Just twenty years earlier, though, the average school year had been closer to four and one-half months a year. The rural trustees argued that they could do in six months what the city schools did in nine because of their "streamlined" curriculum.

Certain other obvious costs were not accounted for because it is assumed that they were borne directly by the patrons. Textbooks, for

example, were usually purchased directly by the students or rented on a cost recovery basis. Writing paper and pencils were usually furnished by the students as well. Pie suppers and "entertainment nights" (where students delivered recitations and "renditions") sponsored by the district were ways that books, athletic equipment, or other niceties might be supplied.

The country schools of the state were slow to consolidate despite the pressures exerted by the schoolmen and their confederate reformers. In 1904, the State of Illinois did pass a series of health and safety measures which outlawed common drinking cups, required separate sanitary privies, and separate cloak halls. These measures did force some of the smaller rural schools out of business since the costs required to meet these standards were more than schools with enrollments less than ten students were willing to meet. Whether or not this forced these same children into nearby schools has not been proved. It might well be the case that the incidence of truancy, always at the 50 percent level in the era, may have gone up.

The lessons learned from the situation in 1902 are several. First, if you establish local funding you minimize state control. As the state's level of financial support grew in proportion to the local budget, the greater the state's influence. Illinois passed Strayer-Haig equalization formulas in the 1930s which resulted in such control. Secondly, if you mandate certain levels of teacher preparation for certification you can force greater salary levels. Again the State of Illinois did this in a later era. Public relations campaigns were also successful. As rural teachers were exposed to educational journals which extolled the use of the state's prescribed curriculum, as teachers' institutes introduced the concept of "professionalism" to the country teachers, and as county superintendents became more committed to progress because of their associations with other schoolmen in educational organizations, subtle attitudinal changes spread, albeit, slowly. The demographic changes were also an important factor. The population of the nation was moving from farm to city. As this took place, the political power shifted. With these changes came the weakening of the rural constituencies. This gave voting power to cities which already contained schools of a more progressive slant. This created more support for state mandates requiring changes in the operation of the schools of their country cousins.

The data presented by the author was easily obtained. But the progress of schools in general, which was widely extolled by the educational journals, and the efforts of the schoolmen to eliminate the embarassment of backwater one-room schoolhouses became more of a quiet war. The World's Fair of 1904, held in St. Louis, Missouri, became a showcase of school progress. The National Education Association held its summer meeting there and there were educational displays from every state in the union. The best foot was placed forward. But beneath this facade was the

stark reality of a large number of country schools with poor facilities, poor instruction, and poor attendance all mixed with grinding poverty and general apathy.

Notes

[1] State of Illinois, *Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction*, July 1, 1902-June 30, 1904, p. 271.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 276.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 151.

[5] *Sears Roebuck Catalog*, (1902 edition), Bounty Books, New York, 1969.

[6] *State Superintendent's Report*, p. 271.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 276.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 140.

ANALYSIS OF MANUSCRIPT CENSUS DATA FOR FIFTEEN- TO SEVENTEEN-YEAR-OLDS IN TOLEDO, OHIO, 1850-1900

Mary C. Grant
University of Toledo

It can be a difficult task to determine whether a relationship existed between a specific behavior and various background circumstances. In attempting to form a general picture of those attending school in the late 19th century, a list of characteristics could be compiled and summarized for students on school rolls. However, this would not yield any information as to which of those characteristics might be specific to school attendance. To carry out an analysis of factors antecedent to school attendance, accurate data would be needed for both those children attending school and those not attending.

Today compliance with compulsory attendance laws essentially guarantees school attendance through the age of sixteen. But prior to World War I the maximum age for compulsory school attendance in Ohio was fourteen. Therefore, those in school past that age were not compelled by law. Attendance at school for those over fourteen was because the students wanted to be there or their parents wanted them to be there.

By examining the characteristics of fifteen-, sixteen- and seventeen-year-olds both in school and not in school, some factors relating to voluntary school attendance might be identified. Data were collected from the *Manuscript Schedules of the U.S. Census* for Toledo, Ohio for the years 1850, 1860, 1870, 1880, and 1900. Data were not available for 1890 because the *Manuscript Schedules* for that year were destroyed in a fire. Since total numbers were small in 1850 and 1860, the entire population was used. For the remaining dates, one in seven, or approximately 14%, systematic samples were taken.

A preliminary examination of the data showed that nearly 95% of those attending school were children of the head of household. Therefore, it was decided to restrict further analyses to subjects who were children of the head of household. For a first, exploratory analysis of the data, certain characteristics were hypothesized as antecedent factors relating to school attendance: sex of the subject, age of the subject, occupation of the subject's parent, the family's length of time in the United States, and the location of the household in the city. Race was not considered as a possible variable since even as late as 1900, less than 1% of the population of Toledo was non-white.

The variables of sex and age are self-explanatory. Occupations were

divided into two groups. Occupations that were considered as professional, managerial, and white collar comprised one group while all other occupations fell into the other group. The family's length of time in the United States was determined by combining the information of birthplace of the subject and birthplace of the head of household. The subjects were then categorized in one of three ways: first generation, when both the subject and the head of household were born outside of the United States; second generation, when the subject was born in the United States but the head of household was born elsewhere; and at least third generation, when both the subject and the head of household were born in the United States. Certain wards in the city were identified as being those encompassing "prestigious addresses" — those where the powerful and affluent lived. The variable of location in the city indicated whether a household was located inside this designated area or not.

Although the *Manuscript Schedules of the U.S. Census* provide a wealth of information which has been microfilmed and is readily accessible, the prospect of analyzing the data and arranging them into some kind of meaningful pattern can be daunting. The common statistical procedures that at first glance seem to provide the desired analysis do not suit the data. A multiple regression approach assumes continuous variables. Most of the variables from the *Manuscript Schedules* are categorical. Although dichotomous variables can be used in a regression model, variables which are polytomous cannot be included in the analysis. Chi square analyzes the relationship between categorical variables, but only two at a time. Multiple chi square analyses allow for neither intercorrelations between variables nor for the determination of an overall model.

A procedure called log-linear analysis is one solution for these problems. Log-linear analysis is an analog to multiple regression useful for nominal variables and like multiple regression it builds models. It allows for the intercorrelation of variables and enables the determination of an overall model for the best fit to the observed data. The determination of an overall model depends on two criteria. One is that the model is a significant improvement over a previous model in a hierarchical arrangement. The other is that the model itself meets a minimum standard of acceptability. Table 1 presents the models selected for each of the Census years.

Table 1:

Models of Antecedent Factors Relating to School Attendance 1850-1900 for Toledo, Ohio

The collection of all variables but school attendance accounts for the inter-relationships not relating to school attendance between the independent variables. Any variables bracketed with school attendance are those which are to be included in the model. When two or more variables are bracketed together with school attendance, an interaction between those variables is related to school attendance.

Year N(or n) = Model	ΔL_2	Δdf	$p > \Delta L_2$	L_2	df	$p > L_2$
1850 N = 113						
[OST][TI]	24.45	2	<.005	8.56	9	.4790
[OST][TI][OI]	5.01	1	<.025	3.55	8	.8952
1860 N = 403						
[OAST][AI][SI][TI]	13.00	1	<.005	37.01	30	.1739
[OAST][ASI][OI][TI]	17.54	2	<.005	17.40	27	.9207
1870 n = 407						
[OAST][OI][AI]	55.36	1	<.005	42.16	32	.1080
[OAST][AI][TI]	56.45	2	<.005	41.07	31	.1067
[OAST][OI][AI][TI]	15.93	1	<.005	25.14	30	.7184
1880 n = 692						
[OASTL][AI][TI]	42.29	2	<.005	80.92	67	.1180
1900 n = 1949						
[OASTL][OI][AI][TI][LI]	39.97	1	<.005	77.66	65	.1350

I = school attendance
O = occupation of parent
A = age of subject
S = sex of subject
T = length of time subject's family has been in U.S.
L = location in the city

The data set for 1850 consisted of only 113 subjects fifteen- to seventeen-years old residing with their parents. This severely limited the possibilities for analysis, so only the variables of family's time in the United States, sex and parent's occupation were considered for the model. Two of the models generated were of interest. One of these models indicated the family's time in the United States as the only variable related to school attendance. Those subjects who were at least third generation American had greater odds of being in school than either second or first generation American subjects; and second generation Americans had slightly better odds on being in school than first generation Americans. It should be noted that greater or increased odds of school attendance are only meaningful in comparing the relative levels of school attendance for various categories; they are not necessarily high in an absolute sense. The overall proportion of fifteen- to seventeen-year-olds in school during the last half of the 19th century in Toledo was less than .5.

Were the data for 1850 from a sample, no further examination would be called for. However, since these data were population data, one other model attracts attention. This second model added parent's occupation to the variable of family's time in the United States as having a relationship with school attendance with no interaction with the other independent variable. In other words, if one variable were held constant, the other variable would have an effect on school attendance. What an examination of the data showed was that parent's occupation only had an appreciable effect on the at least third generation American group. For that group, children of professionals, mangers, and white collar workers had greater odds of being in school than children whose parents had other types of jobs.

For 1860, an entirely different pattern emerged. Since the population for 1860 was 403, another variable, age, was added to the three hypothesized for 1850. Again two of the models were of interest. The first model indicated non-intercorrelated relationships of sex, age, and family's time in the United States with school attendance. The younger a subject was the better the odds that he or she would have been in school; the longer the family had been in the United States the better the odds were that the subject would be in school; and females had better odds of having been in school than males.

As with the first model discussed for 1850, were these data sample data rather than population data, this would be the acceptable model. But, since these also were population data, there was a second model that might offer a more complete picture. This second model was more complex with parent's occupation and family's time in the United States having non-intercorrelated relationships with school attendance and age and sex having an interactive effect on school attendance. This means that the pattern of school attendance for the various ages for males is

different from that for females. For males the percentage of fifteen-year-olds attending school was 60%, for sixteen-year-olds it dropped to 33%, and to 14% for seventeen-year-olds. For females, the percentages remained nearly constant, fluctuating from 49% to 56%. It should be noted that the contribution of parent's occupation in this model is small but its inclusion is required due to the hierarchical structure of the models.

For 1870, a 1:7 systematic sample was drawn and a sample of 407 was obtained. The same four variables hypothesized for 1860 were examined. Two models, each with two non-intercorrelated relationships with school attendance were found minimally acceptable. One model included parent's occupation and age; the other, age and family's time in the United States. In regard to the criteria for selecting a model, these two models were essentially indistinguishable. Therefore, the model including the three effects appearing in the two models was examined. It was found to be significantly better than both of the previous models. So, the model that best fits the data for 1870, included the non-intercorrelated effects of age, parent's occupation, and family's time in the United States. As was the case for the previous decade, the odds that a subject would be in school improved the younger he or she was, the longer his or her family had been in the United States, and if his or her parent's occupation was professional, managerial, or white collar.

The sample size for 1880 was 692. With the increased numbers, another variable, location within the city was added to those hypothesized previously as factors relating to school attendance. However, the model selected contained only two non-intercorrelated factors — age and family's time in the United States. As before, younger subjects had better odds of having been in school; and subjects whose families had been in the United States longer had better odds of having been in school.

For 1900, there were 1,949 in the sample. These data were evaluated for the same five variables used for 1880. The model chosen contained four of the variables, non-intercorrelated. Only the subject's gender was left out of the model. The variable of location was included in the model, with subjects who lived in the wards identified as affluent having had better odds of having attended school. This seemed to have been the case in spite of the fact that in 1900, the one high school in Toledo was located near the center of the city, while the affluent wards were located toward the western end of the city. Again, younger age, longer family residency in the United States, and professional, managerial, and white collar occupations of the parent improved the odds of a subject having been in school.

The models for all of the census years, 1850 to 1900, had one variable in common — that of the length of time the family had been in the United States. Those subjects whose parents were born in the United States were

most likely to have been attending school past the age of any compulsory attendance requirement. And, those subjects who were first generation American had the lowest odds of having attended school past compulsory requirements. Age also appeared in models for all of the years for which it was included among the hypothesized factors — younger children having higher odds of having been in school than older children.

Parent's occupation appeared in models for four of the five census years. But, it should be noted that for both 1850 and 1860, it contributed minimally to the models. Perhaps a better idea of the effect of parent's occupation could have been gotten had occupation been divided into more categories. Or, perhaps it is the case that the parent's occupation was not a strong factor in relation to school attendance, in general.

The variable of gender only appeared in a model for one year, 1860. Whether the reason for the older males leaving school while the females remained had anything to do with the political climate in 1860, or whether some other explanation exists, is not apparent from the data.

These models define some characteristics that were correlated with school attendance in the last half of the 19th century in Toledo, Ohio. It remains to be seen how well these models might agree with the patterns in other developing urban areas.

Bibliography

Gilbert, G.N. (1981). *Modelling Society*. Boston: George Allen & Unwin.

Haberman, S.J. (1979). *Analysis of Qualitative Data*. New York: Academic Press.

Kennedy, J.J. (1983). *Analyzing Qualitative Data*. New York: Praeger.

Knoke, D. & Burke, P.J. (1980). *Log-Linear Models*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY IN GRADUATES AND NON-GRADUATES OF AN URBAN HIGH SCHOOL, 1915 — 1925

Sam R. Snyder
University of Toledo

> The dominant perspective, until the past decade, was that the American public schools were the highest realization of the democratic ideal, that they provided equal opportunity to all and rapid mobility to the deserving.[1]

To what extent was high school graduation a factor in occupational mobility for males during the years 1915, 1920, and 1925? Did the sons of working class fathers who graduated from high school during these years tend to rise higher than their fathers in occupational status, remain the same, or slide lower on the occupational ladder? Did blue-collar workers produce blue-collar sons, or did the sons of blue-collar workers become white-collar workers, or managerial and professional people? The terms "higher" and "lower" are of course relative and reflect the biases of the investigators constructing the occupational scales. For example, in the table used in this study, all white-collar occupations are assigned a lower number (designating higher status) than blue-collar occupations, regardless of such considerations as amount or source of income or social utility.

In this study, all male graduates of Toledo's Scott High School are taken in 1915 and 1920 (Scott's first graduating class was in 1914) and a random sample is taken from the graduating class of 1925. Each group is then followed for a 25-year period after graduation, occupational status being assigned for last civilian job held as listed in the city directory.

In the second part of the study a random sample of male Scott students is taken, equal in number to the graduates, who did not graduate from high school. Their occupational careers are then followed for twenty-five years and are then compared with their cohorts who were high school graduates.

The third part of the study compares the graduates and the non-graduates with their fathers in terms of occupational status. The basis for comparison for both graduates and non-graduates was father's occupation.

Class of 1915

The graduation class of 1915 consisted of 170 students, 100 females

and 70 males. Of the total male population, I was able to follow twenty-two through listings in the Toledo City Directories for the years 1920, 1925, 1930, 1935, and 1940. In terms of occupations, the 22 graduates were distributed as follows: (The occupational code number is also given).

salesman (3)	4	accountant (01)	1
music teacher (01)	1	sales manager (02)	1
dentist (01)	1	manager (02)	2
lawyer (01)	1	proprietor (02)	2
RR conductor (06)	1	city fireman (06)	1
corporate officer (02)	3	clerk (03)	1
superintendent (02)	1	draftsman (05)	1
branch manager (02)	1		

(N = 22)

Scott High School opened its doors in the fall of 1913 and graduated its first class in the spring of 1914. The 1915 yearbook lists 82 boys in the junior class. Of these, only 48 names appear the next year as part of the graduating class of 70 males. Where the 22 names came from to make up the graduating class of 1915 is not known, but they presumably were transfer students because they had not been listed as members of the graduating class the previous year.

From the 1914 yearbook I took the names of the 33 males who were listed as members of the class of 1915 but did not graduate the following year with their class. I was able to locate 21 of these male non-graduates in the city directories for the years 1920, 1930, and 1940. The occupational breakdown for these non-graduates is as follows:

electrical contractor (01)	1	inspector (03)	1
student	1	artist (03)	1
salesman (03)	3	factory worker (06)	1
clerk (03)	3	engineer, RR (06)	2
corporate officer (02)	2	proprietor (02)	2
deputy sheriff (06)	1	no occupation	2
service manager (03)	1		

N = 21

The occupational code used is as follows:

01 = professional	05 = skilled laborer
02 = managerial, proprietor	06 = semi-skilled laborer
03 = clerk, salesman	07 = unskilled laborer

The following table represents an analysis of graduates and nongraduates regarding occupational status:

Occupational Code	Graduates	Non-Graduates
01	4	2
02	10	4
03	5	8
05	1	
06	2	4
07		
Other		3
	N = 22	N = 21

On the basis of this analysis, we conclude that while 14% of the graduates and 33% of the non-graduates were in blue-collar occupations, it was in the white-collar occupations that high school graduation seemed to make a difference. In the highest category, artists and professionals, 18% of the high school graduates were found but only 10% of the non-graduates.

In the second white-collar category, managers and proprietors, 45% of the graduates were found as opposed to 19% of the non-graduates. At the lowest echelon of white-collar workers, clerks and salesmen, are found 23% of the graduates and 38% of the non-graduates. Granting the limitations of such a small sample, it seems obvious at this point that high school graduation was a potent factor in occupational mobility.

The next step in process was to ascertain, as far as possible, father's occupation of the graduates and non-graduates of 1915. In this way we could determine where the subject's occupation was on the scale in relation to the occupational status of his father. Of the 22 graduates from the class of 1915 that I followed for 25 years, I was able to obtain father's occupation for only 11 of them. They are as follows:

Subject's Occupation	*Father's Occupation*
lawyer 01	teacher (mother) 01
RR conductor 06	switchman 06
superintendent 02	proprietor 02
corporate officer 02	superintendent 02
accountant 01	ruler 05
sales manager 02	proprietor 02
salesman 03	corporate officer 02
manager 02	proprietor 02
corporate officer 02	corporate officer 02
city fireman 06	city fireman 06
draftsman 05	RR conductor 06

Of the 21 non-graduates, there were twelve for whom I was able to establish that they had attended Scott but had not graduated and for these I was able to establish father's occupation. These data are contained in the following table:

Subject's Occupation	*Father's Occupation*
salesman 03	corporate officer 02
proprietor 02	corporate officer 02
deputy sheriff 03	collector 03
service manager 03	watchmaker 05
RR engineer 06	plumber 05
clerk 03	clerk 03
artist 01	union officer 03
factory worker 07	machinest 05
engineer 01	teacher (mother) 01
corporate officer 02	proprietor 02
corporate officer 02	general manager 02
clerk 03	proprietor 02

When we combine the categories, we find the following:

Year = 1915

Occupation	Graduates		Fathers		Non-Graduates		Fathers	
Code	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
01	2	18	1	9	2	17	1	8
02	4	36	5	45	2	17	5	42
03	2	18	1	9	5	42	3	25
Total	8	73%	7	64%	9	75%	9	75%
05	1	9	1	9			3	25
06	2	18	3	27	2		17	
07					1		8	
Total	3	27%	4	36%	3	25%	3	25%

What I found did not correspond to the "conventional wisdom" about schooling. In the class of 1915, 73% of the graduates in the sample worked their adult years in white-collar occupations, half of them at the level of managers or proprietors. A fourth of them entered professions and a fourth worked at lower-level white-collar jobs as clerks, salesmen, and supervisors.

Sixty-four percent of their fathers had come from white-collar occupations, 45% of them as managers and proprietors, and 9% each as professionals on the one hand or low-level white-collar workers on the other.

Of the graduates of 1915, 27% went into blue-collar occupations, 9% as skilled workers and 18% as semi-skilled workers. Thirty-six percent of

the fathers of this graduating class came from blue-collar occupations. 9% from skilled workers and 27% from semi-skilled occupations.

Of the non-graduates, those young men who had been enrolled in high school the previous year but did not graduate, 75% of them worked at the lowest level as clerks, salesmen, or office functionaries. The others in this white-collar group divided themselves evenly between professionals and the proprietor-managerial class.

Twenty-five percent of the non-graduates pursued blue-collar occupations, all of them as semi-skilled or unskilled labor. The non-graduates duplicated their fathers occupationally although while the fathers were skilled workers, none of the non-graduates were.

1920

The number of male graduates in the class of 1920 was 100, an increase of 30% over the number of male graduates in 1915. From these 100, I was able to trace 39 through the city directories of 1925, 1935, and 1945. The occupations of this group are as follows:

corporate officer (02)	8	office assistant (03)	1
dentist (01)	2	insurance adjuster (03)	1
M.D. (01)	3	architect (01)	1
clerk (03)	2	glassworker (06)	1
foreman (03)	1	draftsman (05)	1
salesman (03)	2	insurance agent (03)	1
deputy marshall (03)	1	switchman (06)	1
inspector (03)	1	chiropracter (01)	1
lawyer (01)	4	superintendent (03)	1
millwright (05)	1	proprietor (02)	1
engineer (01)	2	credit manager (02)	1
towerman (06)	1		

N = 39

The Class of 1920 entered Scott High School as freshmen in the fall of 1916. At that time the number of freshmen males was 294. By the time the class actually graduated four years later the number of male graduates had been reduced to 100, an attrition rate of 66%. I was able to follow 30 of these non-graduates through the city directories of 1925, 1935, and 1945. The following table illustrates the occupations for this group:

clerk (03)	4	polisher (06)	1
bricklayer (05)	1	car man (06)	1
proprietor (02)	3	lather (05)	1
diemaker (05)	1	lawyer (01)	1
machine hand (06)	1	engineer (01)	1
salesman (03)	5	commercial artist (01)	1
body builder (06)	1	locomotive fireman (06)	1

reporter (03)	1	agent (03)	2
manager (02)	2	tool & die maker (05)	1
superintendent (02)	1		

N = 30

Comparing graduates and non-graduates for 1920, we derive the following tabulation:

Occupation	Graduates	Non-Graduates
01	13	3
02	10	6
03	11	12
Total	34	21
05	2	4
06	3	5
07		
Total	5	9
	N = 39	N = 30

Of the 39 male graduates of the Class of 1920 that I was able to follow over a twenty-five year period, there were only 24 for whom I could definitely establish father's occupation. I was able to ascertain father's occupation for all 30 of the non-graduates. The following tabulation represents occupations and father's occupations for both graduates and non-graduates of 1920.

Year = 1920

Occupation Code	Graduates N	%	Fathers N	%	Non-Graduates N	%	Fathers N	%
01	10	42	3	13	2	7	2	7
02	5	21	9	38	7	24	8	28
03	7	3	8	33	12	41	11	38
Total	22	92%	20	83%	21	72%	21	72%
05			2	8	4	14	3	10
06	2	8	2	8	4	14	4	14
07							1	3
Total	2	8%	4	17%	8	28%	8	28%

In the graduating class of 1920, ninety-two percent of the class followed white-collar occupations, 42% of them in the professions, 21% as managers and proprietors, and 3% in lower-level white-collar work. Eighty-three percent of their fathers were in white-collar occupations, although the majority (38%) were proprietors and managers. Thirty-three percent were lower-level white-collar workers, and only eight percent were professionals.

Only 8% of the 1920 graduating class went into blue-collar occupations, all of them at the semi-skilled level. Seventeen percent of their fathers came from blue-collar backgrounds, all of them in skilled or semi-skilled occupations. Twenty-eight percent of the non-graduates went into blue-collar occupations, the same percentage as that of their fathers. While the fathers came from all categories of blue-collar workers, there were no unskilled workers among the sons who had attended high school.

1925

By 1925, the number of males graduating from Scott High School had ballooned to 272, an increase of 37%. I took one-half of these by selecting every other name on the roster of graduating males. I then followed this group through the city directories for 1930, 1935, 1940, 1945, and 1950. Following are the occupations of those for whom I was able to obtain information:

corporate officer (02)	4	engineer (01)	1
florist (02)	1	broker (02)	2
accountant (01)	3	pharmacist (01)	1
salesman (03)	7	inspector (03)	1
superintendent (02)	1	lawyer (01)	3
US military (06)	6	grocer (02)	1
draftsman (05)	1	insurance agent (03)	1
clerk (03)	8	mechanic (05)	2
driver (06)	1	painter (06)	1
manager (02)	1	tug captain (06)	1
machine operator (05)	1	factory worker (06)	3
buyer (02)	1	entertainer (02)	1
proprietor (02)	1	chemist (01)	1
RR conductor (06)	1	teacher (01)	1
grinder (06)	1	toolmaker (05)	1
M.D. (01)	1		

N = 60

The class that graduated in the spring of 1925 had entered as freshmen in the fall of 1921. From the roster of males in the Freshman Class of 1922 I randomly selected 109 names. I then followed them through the city directories for the years 1930, 1940, and 1950. The occupations are listed of those for whom this information was obtained:

corporate officer (02)	3	machinest (05)	1
foreman (03)	2	clerk (03)	3
surveyor (05)	1	auto trimmer (06)	1
supervisor (03)	2	proprietor (02)	2
pattern maker (05)	1	repairman (05)	1
factory worker (06)	1	checker (06)	1
penmaker (05)	1	welder (05)	1
salesman (03)	5	engineer (01)	1
inspector (03)	1	manager (02)	1

N = 29

The relatively small total number in this sample is due to the difficulty in documenting (1) father's occupations, (2) that the subject was indeed not a high school graduate, and (3) that the subject still lived in Toledo after leaving high school. The time span involved (1925-1950) covers two cataclysmic events in our national history, the Great Depression and World War II.

Given such times of dislocation it seems reasonable to assume that (1) many young men left the area during the depression looking for work, (2) large numbers of them went into the military service during World War II, and (3) many of them never returned to Toledo after the depression and war years.

When we combine the categories of graduates and non-graduates and compare their occupations with those of their fathers, we find the following:

Year = 1925

Occupation Code	Graduates N	%	Fathers N	%	Non-Graduates N	%	Fathers N	%
01	8	13	3	5	1	4	2	7
02	23	36	30	47	8	29	7	25
03	18	28	18	28	10	36	11	39
Total	49	77%	51	80%	19	68%	20	71%
05	9	14	9	14	6	21	5	18
06	6	9	4	6	3	11	3	11
07								
Total	15	23%	13	20%	9	32%	8	29%
	64		64		28		28	

Seventy-seven percent of the graduates of 1925 went into white-collar occupations, compared with 80% of their fathers. However, while 47% of the fathers in white-collar occupations were in the managerial-proprietor class, only 36% of the sons were. Thirteen percent of the graduates went into professional occupations, as opposed to only 5% of their fathers. The percentage in low-level white-collar occupations is the same for both fathers and sons. (28%)

Of the non-graduates, 68% went into white-collar occupations, contrasted with 71% of their fathers. However, this white-collar group is heavily loaded toward the lower-level occupations. Thirty-six percent of the non-graduates and 39% of their fathers were at the lowest level: clerks, salesmen, and supervisors.

In the blue-collar occupations, 21% of the non-graduates and 18% of

their fathers were skilled workers: 11% in each group were engaged in semi-skilled occupations.

In terms of occupational mobility, it seems safe to say that family background is a much stronger factor than graduation from high school, at least in the years following the first World War and just prior to the Great Depression.

If we consider all categories for all years in the aggregate, we arrive at the following figures:

Years: 1915, 1920, 1925

Occupation Code	Graduates N	%	Fathers N	%	Non-Graduates N	%	Fathers N	%
01	20	20	7	7	5	7	5	7
02	32	33	44	44	17	14	20	29
03	27	27	27	27	27	39	25	36
Total	79	80%	78	79%	49	71%	50	72%
05	10	10	12	12	10	14	11	16
06	10	10	9	9	9	13	7	10
07					1	1	1	1
Total	20	20%	21	21%	20	29%	19	28%
Aggregate	99		99		69		69	

In other words, if we compare graduates to non-graduates over all years, we find that 80% of the high school graduates went into white-collar occupations, as opposed to 71% of the non-graduates. Further, we find that 20% of the high school graduates end up in the highest occupational category while only 7% of the non-graduates do. Furthermore, only 7% of the fathers were found in this category for both groups. Consequently, we can conclude that high school graduation is a necessary condition for young men entering the professions during this period.

In the second occupational category, that of managers and proprietors, we find 33% of high school graduates as opposed to 39% of the non-graduates. When we compare these men with their fathers, we find that 44% of the graduates' fathers were in this category compared with 29% of the nongraduates.

Thirty-seven percent of the high school graduates find themselves in the lowest white-collar category, the same as their fathers. Thirty-nine percent of the non-graduates are in this category, slightly more than the 36% of their fathers.

Thus, while 80% of the graduates are in white-collar occupations, 79% of them came from white-collar backgrounds. Seventy-one percent

of the non-graduates go into white-collar occupations, but 72% of them also came from white-collar backgrounds. What is significant is that of the graduates who go into white-collar occupations, the majority (53%) enter the top two categories, as professionals or proprietor-managers. Of the 71% of the non-graduates who enter white-collar occupations, the majority (39% of the total) go into the lowest echelon of white-collar work as salesmen, clerks, and bookkeepers.

It seems clear, then, that within white collar occupations, the sons of fathers in the lowest echelons tend to remain at that level, whether or not they graduate from high school. For fathers in the second echelon, sons who graduate from high school tend to remain at that level or rise to the highest echelon, while sons who do not graduate tend to remain at the same level or slide to the lowest echelon.

The same is not true for young men from blue-collar backgrounds. Twenty percent of the graduates went into blue-collar occupations; 21% of the graduates came from blue-collar backgrounds. Twenty-nine percent of the non-graduates went into blue-collar occupations; 28% of them came from blue-collar backgrounds.

Within the category of blue-collar occupations, graduates who were the sons of skilled workers tended to become skilled workers or to slide into semi-skilled occupations. The same pattern holds for non-graduates who are sons of skilled workers. However, the numbers here are much smaller and one hesitates to hazard a generalization based upon so few instances.

In light of the foregoing, it seems reasonable to conclude that for the period under consideration, high school graduates tended to rise higher than non-graduates in occupational status when (1) the sons came from white-collar backgrounds and (2) their fathers were already at the second level within the white-collar category. Graduates whose fathers were at level 3 tended not to rise above that level.

Sons from white-collar families who did not graduate from high school did not do as well as high school graduates from the same background and they did not rise above the occupational level of their fathers.

There is no evidence, from this limited study, to suggest occupational mobility from blue-collar to white-collar occupations, nor is their mobility within blue-collar occupations. High School graduation is a factor for young men from white-collar backgrounds only in moving from level 2 to level 1 for maintaining status at level 2.

Sources

Polk's *Toledo City Directory* (Toledo, Ohio: Toledo Directory Co.), 1915, 1920, 1925, 1930, 1935, 1940, 1945, 1950.

Ravitch, Diane. *The Schools We Deserve* (New York: Basic Books, 1985).

Jesup W. Scott High School, Student Records, Toledo, Ohio.

The Scottonian (Toledo, Ohio: *Scottonian* Board), 1914, 1915, 1920, 1925.

Notes

[1] Diane Ravitch, *The Schools We Deserve* (New York: Basic Books, 1985), p. 182.

Part III
GENDER AND CULTURE IN AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL HISTORY

FEMALE PARTICIPATION IN THE NEA, 1857-1912

Bonnie S. Handler
Central Connecticut State University

The idea of forming a national teacher's association grew out of the desire to unite fifteen established state teachers' associations into one great educational "Brotherhood" of practical teachers who wished to promote the educational welfare of the country as well as to advance the interests of the profession. Thus, a convention was called on August 26, 1857, in Philadelphia.[1] Forty-one schoolmen, one of whom brought his wife, and one other female were in attendance.

Conditions were ripe for this gathering as there was a complex set of educational events which had already occurred prior to 1857, and there were attendant issues to be addressed concerning the educational future of the country. First, political, social and economic forces in the early nineteenth century had increased the demand for the new common schools, and the principle of maintaining high schools at public expense had already been established in practice. Hence, with the increase of pupils attending the public school system, new physical plants were needed in addition to existing school buildings in order to house the burgeoning constituents. Second, colleges and universities were complaining that a standard curriculum leading to college entrance was necessary as there was a variety of preparation among entering students. Third, elementary schools up to this point had gone little further than teaching the "3 R's," and students at the new public high schools needed a balanced and sequenced curriculum, broader in scope and depth, if they were to keep pace with the nation's educational thrust. What of the curriculum in colleges and universities? Would they not have to build a new foundation beginning on a higher plain in order to suit their graduates both for work and for life? Fourth, there was the question of the education of the female. The home was no longer the only sphere in which she wished to move. She sought what her brothers had already attained and rebelled against her life of restriction and protection. Finally, there was the question to which this paper is addressed: the question of the role of the female teacher in the National Education Association. At first, a product of a meager education, she quested for self-improvement, self-sufficiency, self-support, recognition and, if not true equality, at least no longer to be a still small voice in the educational scheme of things. The National Teachers' Association had convened to unite all of these "scattered and diverse efforts" (Wesley, 1956; 19) and as stated by Dr. D.B. Hager of Salem, Massachusetts, in his presidential address at that first prophetic meeting, "Behold how great a matter a little fire kindleth" (*NEA*, Proceedings, 1884; 24).

At a meeting in 1830, The American Institute of Instruction, one of the forerunners of the NEA, met to write their constitution. They had barred women from membership but had allowed "ladies engaged in teaching to hear the annual addresses, lectures and reports of committees on subjects of education" (*NEA*, Proceedings, 1879; 9). Being seen but not heard, then, had been established long before the 1857 meeting. Thus, it came as no surprise to female teachers of the day, that they were barred from active membership in the NTA as well. They were thrown a bone, however, in being able to seek honorary membership in an association which accorded them the dubious privilege of writing essays on educational topics to be read by any active male member, after which their topic would be assigned to other male members for discussion. In restricting membership to "gentlemen," the organization may not have been guilty of overt discrimination, but of upholding the convention of the day. When the association met the following year, they heartily endorsed Henry Barnard's *American Journal of Education* and adopted a resolution which "praised women and blessed female teachers," (*NEA*, Proceedings, 1858; 107), apparently oblivious to the lack of female members. In 1860, members came from twenty states, but once again females were conspicuously absent.

The NTA did not meet the following two years because of the Civil War and the absence of representation from the seceded states. When the organization reconvened in 1863, in Chicago, they had an unexpected and unprecedented attendance of between sixteen hundred and two thousand, about one fourth of whom were female teachers (*NEA*, Proceedings, 1865; 231). The high percentage of females was due to the fact that during the Civil War, out of necessity, females had replaced males in the classroom — first in elementary schools, then in high schools.[2] Until the Civil War, male teachers had far outnumbered female teachers, but by 1870, female teachers reversed that trend by a margin of at least two to one (*NEA*, Proceedings, 1872; 184). Moreover, by 1873, over 16,000 females had matriculated at high school, compared to less than 13,000 males, indicating that females, formally or numerically at least, were better educated than their male counterparts.

With the substitution of the word "person" for "gentleman" in defining qualifications for membership to the NTA, women teachers were able, in theory, to attain full membership status. With the reorganization of the NTA under the new title of National Education Association, encompassing ten state organizations as well as the absorption of the American Normal School Association and the National Association of School Superintendents, female members would steadily hold about one-fourth of the membership after 1870. Yet, for the NEA's first fifty years, females were practically excluded from policy making decisions and it appears that, at least until the turn of the century, female members, for the most part, remained docile and uncomplaining with respect to their lack of recognition in proportion to their membership.

Their status, in practice, was to be described as, "We came; we sat; we were conquered" (Fenner, 1945; 16).

Until 1900, only about a dozen or so papers written by females were included in the NEA Proceedings. Several of these were on the importance of kindergarten teaching, which male members endorsed as fitting and proper work for the non-intellectual young female teacher. Woman teachers were, then, allowed to monopolize the offices of the Kindergarten Department and to have a fair share of the Elementary Department offices because the males felt that they were filled with maternal longing, "a warm heart, boundless aspirations . . . love and youthful sympathy with little ones" (*NEA*, Proceedings, 1879; 67), as opposed to the physical and mental strength, scholarship and high intellect of the males — asserting, of course, that there was an intellectual difference inherent to the sexes. In 1874, Professor James Orton of Vassar College and Professor Tyler at Amherst declared, that ineradicable distinctions of sex were stamped on the brain; that women were less reflective, less reasonable and less able to make intelligent judgments than men (*NEA*, Proceedings, 1874; 109-118). Moreover, they claimed that females would never "advance literature, science or art by original thought, investigation or invention" (*NEA*, Proceedings, 1874; 116).

To achieve status in secondary education was harder for females because of the belief that women teachers were physically unable to discipline and control any but the smaller children, and that women were intellectually incapable of teaching advanced pupils. Therefore, until the early 1870's, women teachers were found mostly in the lower grades where attendance was of mixed ages, or in summer school where the "big" boys were excluded due to work chores. But by the 1880's there was a tendency toward almost exclusively employing females as teachers in both elementary and high schools, since they were willing to accept less than half of the salaries of men, low status and dim prospects. The job of supervision and school management was, however, exclusively carried on by the men.

The "feminization" of the school system was both resisted and resented by men. W.E. Anderson of Milwaukee stated at the 1891 NEA meeting that (p. 423):

> This predominance of female teachers seems to be regretted in nearly all respectable school reports. The superiority of men over women as teachers is by a large number regarded as so self-evident that the decline in the ratio of male teachers is mentioned almost invariably with regret. The disproportion, which seems to increase from year to year, is, however, a fact which defies legislative remedy or control . . . .

Despite the limits of her female status as defined by the majority of male members, Mrs. May W. Sewall of Massachusetts in 1884 decided

to bring the issue of gender equality within the organization and within the profession to the foreground. Amazed that the audience had been persistently addressed as "gentlemen" — although there were many females present — she proceeded to scold the men. Argued Mrs. Sewall (*NEA*, Proceeding, 1884: 153):

> Notwithstanding the fluttering of fans and the fluttering of ribbons, and gay waving plumes, and glancing smiles and the eloquent blushes from the audiences, speakers have persisted in addressing their audiences as 'gentlemen.'

Mrs. Sewall chided the male NEA officers for failing to choose any female for a position in administrative leadership. Rhetorically, she asked her audience to recall who it was that inspired them? "Was it not a female teacher who inspired all of you beyond what seemed to be your limits?" (*NEA*, Proceedings, 1884: 154-55). In the field of education, more than any other field, she ventured, women had "gained accuracy, promptness, punctuality, order and business acuity . . . theretofore monopolized by men" (*NEA*, Proceedings, 1884; 155). Why had women not received their proper due? There was no discussion following her paper, contrary to the custom. Apparently the male members did not wish to discuss nor debate Mrs. Sewall's question.

By the turn of the century, however, women could not stay educationally and professionally suppressed. Already 4,000 to 5,000 females had graduated from colleges and universities (*NEA*, Proceedings, 1902; 100-103). Although the number of male students in colleges increased 60.0 percent, women students increased 148.7 percent (*NEA*, Proceedings, 1902; 101). College officials foresaw that women were taking over. Adelbert College in Cleveland, Ohio, after fifteen years of co-education, closed its doors to women in 1888; Stanford University limited the number of female students; Columbia males were annoyed at Barnard's women over the use of the campus and baths; University of Chicago men were discourteous to female students at convocation exercises; and at Northwestern University, it was "viewed with concern" that ten short years hence, females were projected to compose one-half of the student body (*NEA*, Proceedings, 1902; 100-103). Articles written by males on variations of the theme that a woman's place is in the home appeared in current magazines and state educational journals. G. Stanley Hall, President of Clark University, insisted that higher education not only reduced the rate of both marriage and offspring, but also caused mental strain in "early womanhood, resulting in imperfect mamory [sic.] function, which is the first step of the slow evolution of sterility" (*NEA*, Proceedings, 1904; 538). Even *The Ladies Home Journal*, in 1903, in a plea to its readership (and to insure continued circulation) addressed the evils of educating females. The magazine stated that too much education for females would lead to a "complexion of ill health" (*NEA*, Proceedings, 1903; 450) or *worse*, as alleged by an unsigned letter to the managing

editor (*NEA*, Proceedings, 1903: 457):

> Mary, just budding into sweet womanhood, entered the high school. She became ambitious in her studies, and now she is an angel in heaven.

After the turn of the century, female teachers increasingly dominated the school scene, as men were reluctant to enter the profession. Low salaries and no firmly established tenure policy were a few of the drawbacks. But the NEA remained a male controlled association. When referring to articles on the dismissal of the rank-and-file teacher, or on the question of what is wrong with our schools, male writers substituted the pronoun *she* for the word teacher. When the Proceedings referred to an administrator or supervisor, the pronoun *he* was used. When a plea was made for increased normal schools, their improvement of curricula, or more attendant scholarship on the part of the student, it was the *she* teacher or student who was inadequate.

Mrs. Carrie C. Cott of New York City argued in 1902 (*NEA*, Proceedings, 1902; 103), that in all of the college commencement orations and baccalaureate sermons she had received, which had been delivered at the various co-educational institutions of higher education, not a single reference was made to the future of women students. Said Mrs. Cott, (*NEA*, Proceedings, 1902; 104) " . . . no word of advice, nor inspiration to endeavor, no hope of achievement was offered to women graduates." Limiting the liberty of the "well-endowed woman to use her talent . . . is as great a crime against race progress as to limit the liberty of a man" stated Mrs. Cott (*NEA*, Proceedings, 1902; 104).

In examining the question of co-education in high schools and higher education, many male critics prescribed separate curricula for the sexes. They were advocating a less rigorous curriculum for the female based not only on the sex biases of the day but also on supposedly scientifically grounded principles. One speaker at the 1890 NEA Convention, concerned over the co-education debacle, feared reverse discrimination. He openly declared that he was (*NEA*, Proceedings, 1890; 344)

> . . . fearful lest the boys will not obtain co-education with girls . . . girls are to become the educated sex . . . .

He confessed the fact that, unconsciously, the tide was turning.

While the male school administrator and supervisor had social status and renumeration, the female classroom teacher had not only been relegated to low status in society, but also consigned to a similar position within the profession. Injustices within the profession, small salary, uncertain future, little voice in the policy making of her representative organization, the NEA, all aided in the arousal of her social consciousness, and caused her to strike out against those males in the upper

echelons of the organization. She wished to emerge from passivity and almost invisibility to a place of prominence and leadership — especially within her professional organization, but she needed representation.

In 1907, Mrs. Ella Flagg Young spoke to the heart of the organization — that is, to the rank-and-file teacher — on the point that isolation of the great body of teachers from the administration must be overcome. It was obvious that she was a natural choice to lead the organization and at least to symbolically reverse the tide. It took, however, several years of hard work and planning for Mrs. Young to attain what her female compatriots so desired, to become the first woman president of the NEA. At her first NEA meeting in 1867, she was one of those female teachers permitted to sit in the gallery listening to the discussions carried on by the men. Moreover, she came through the ranks of the organization, having presented twelve papers for discussion between 1887 and 1918, and having participated in numerous debates.

Mrs. Young had begun her teaching career after she graduated from Chicago Normal School in 1862 at the age of seventeen. She secured a position teaching elementary education, and after several years she was made principal of the Skinner School. Appointed district superintendent in 1887, she remained in that position for twelve years until a disagreement with the superintendent. Appointed Professor of Education by President William Rainey Harper at the University of Chicago, she was a great friend and colleague of John Dewey and his wife. When John Dewey left for New York and Columbia University in 1905, Mrs. Young resigned her position, after serving six years, and accepted the principalship of the Chicago Normal School. Four years later she was elected superintendent of the Chicago School system, one of the first females appointed to such a position in a large system. Mrs. Young is credited with expanding the kindergarten curricula, increasing the scope of vocational training, and streamlining the curricula of the primary grades.

A member of the State Board of Education in Illinois for fourteen years, she was named president of the State Teachers' Association in 1910, one year before taking on the presidency of the NEA. Editor of the *Educational Bi-Monthly* from 1906 to 1909, she authored many articles and monographs in a series called "Contributions to Education, University of Chicago." She also collaborated in the Young and Field *Literary Readers*. An outspoken, practical and principled woman, she apparently went back for a university education at the age of fifty-one while she was superintendent of Chicago schools. Said Jane Addams of her, "She had more general intelligence and character than any other woman I knew" (*NEA*, Proceedings, 1918; 685).

Mrs. Young's election to the presidency of the NEA was the result of strategic planning on the part of her backers. It was the first time supporters were solicited through letters and circulars. A full scale

campaign, complete with campaign buttons, was run by Grace Strachan and Katherine D. Blake of New York and Margaret Haley of Chicago, a veteran battler for teachers' rights. A.E. Winship, editor of the *Journal of Education*, Carroll G. Pearse, superintendent of Milwaukee schools, Francis G. Blair and other males prominent and influential in educational circles are said to have favored her for election (Wesley, 1956; 326).

When the nominating committee met, the majority of them voted to propose Z.X. Snyder, president of the Normal School at Greeley, Colorado. Katherine Blake and A.E. Winship were the only members who apparently favored the nomination of Mrs. Young. In a calculated but surprise move, Miss Blake obtained the floor and moved to substitute the minority report which had proposed Mrs. Young, for the majority report favoring Snyder. When the convention voted on the issue, 617 to 376 favored Mrs. Young, and she ascended to the presidency (*NEA*, Proceedings, 1910; 32-33).

Miss Blake, in her speech confirming the nomination of Mrs. Young, spoke for the female members of the organization when she stated (*NEA*, Proceedings, 1910; 32-33):

> For the first time in the history of this organization a woman has been mentioned for the high office that has been filled for so many years by so many distinguished men, and for the first time we have a woman who stands, frail and little as she is, towering above those that are about her.

Other supporters decried the fact that they had supported her because she was a female; they simply claimed that she was the best qualified. Her opponents, on the other hand, argued that their opposition was not based on sex discrimination but on the full-blown campaign that heretofore had been unprecedented. Despite any protests, Mrs. Young's election was seen as a feminist victory. When a similar tactic was tried the following year to elect another female president, it failed, and Mrs. Young was criticized for the lack of her support for the new female candidate. Another female was not elected until 1917, after which, until 1945, the presidency alternated male-female every other year.

Concomitant with the rising strength of female teachers within the organization was a unique department authorized by the NEA in 1907. Representatives of six women's organizations met with NEA officials and drew up a petition for the creation of the Educational Department of National Organizations of Women. This organization, the actual forerunner of the PTA, was designed to bring the home and school in closer contact. Working for restrictions of child labor, compulsory attendance, improved school facilities, better teachers' salaries, teacher preparation, and a host of other curricular improvements, the lay group earned the admiration and approval of the educators. Thus, with the help of this group of females outside the association, the organization was changed from within.

Women finally had won the acceptance of the NEA. From within the profession and within the association, females now began to assume an equal share of the leadership.

Notes

[1] These state teacher's associations included Rhode Island, New York, Massachusetts, Ohio, Connecticut, Vermont, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Illinois, New Jersey, Iowa, New Hampshire, Indiana and Missouri (Wesley, 1956; 18).

[2] In 1856 men teachers in the State of Indiana, for example, outnumbered women four to one — 3,973 to 1,070 (Wesley, 1956; 324).

References

Bagley, William C. *A Century of The Universal School*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1937.

Brackett, Anna C. Ed. *Women and The Higher Education*. New York: Harper Bros., 1893.

Fenner, Mildred S. *NEA History*. Washington, D.C.: NEA Association, 1945.

Krug, Edward A. *The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920*. Milwaukee: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1969.

Mattingly, Paul. *The Classless Profession*. New York: New York University Press, 1975.

McManis, John T. *Ella Flagg Young*. Chicago: A.C. McClurg, 1916.

NEA, Proceedings, 1857-1912. Washington, D.C.: NEA Association.

Wesley, Edgar B. *NEA: The First Hundred Years*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1957.

SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL INFLUENCES SHAPING THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN MIND: SOME TENTATIVE THOUGHTS

Guadalupe San Miguel, Jr.
University of California,
Santa Barbara

The 1920s and 1930s were a period of great change in the Mexican communities of the southwest. Economic cycles of prosperity and depression, changing political climates, and rapid social change helped shape life in the Mexican community. Life in the Mexican community was also shaped by internal developments, including the large influx of Mexican immigrants, the various strains of socio-political ideologies held by groups of individuals, and the pressing needs of economic survival in an increasingly hostile environment.[1]

In the midst of these changes a quiet revolution was brewing. Mexican descent individuals, despite personal hardships, institutional obstacles, and societal prejudices, were beginning to attend secondary and post-secondary institutions. These individuals were members of the Mexican-American Generation in formation.

Members of the Mexican-American Generation were what one sociologist called "Second Generation Mexicans" and what modern historians refer to as "First Generation Americans of Mexican descent." For the most part, members of the Mexican-American Generation were either born or raised in the United States after 1890 or around the turn of the century and went to school during the period from 1910 to 1940. Although few in numbers, their influence was significant.

These individuals through their organizations articulated a distinct set of intellectual ideas relating to the status and improvement of the Mexican-American in the United States social order. Unlike Mexican immigrants residing north of the border, Mexican-Americans peldged their allegiance to the United States and worked to ensure the active participation of their racial group in the mainstream of American life. These individuals remained culturally Mexican but philosophically and politically American. Their ideas noted one historian became "the intellectual waves of the future for the Mexicans" in the United States. These individuals became the leaders of the Mexican-American community and the prime movers of the struggle for civil rights, equality of opportunity, and education.[2]

The new consciousness of the Mexican-American Generation was shaped by several important social and institutional forces. Richard Garcia, for example, has suggested that the socialization practices of

64

individual Mexican families contributed to the formation of a dual identity among the children. Families, according to Garcia's argument, encouraged their children to be proud of their cultural heritage and to learn American customs, especially the English language.[3]

One aspect of American culture and behavior increasingly promoted by Mexican families during the 1920s pertained to education. Although data is lacking it is very possible that family members as well as other significant individuals motivated Mexican children to become literate, appreciate intellectual ideas, and attend school. Anthony Quinn, for instance, suggests in his autobiography that his mother inculcated in him an appreciation for books while a close personal friend provided him with access to new books throughout his early years. Ernesto Galarza acknowledges in his autobiography Barrio Boy that several individuals, including his parents, Miss Hopley, his elementary school principal, and a friend from the community, Mr. Howard, were instrumental in encouraging him to learn American customs while maintaining his Mexican identity intact. These documents support Garcia's contention that individual and family socialization practices played an important role in nurturing the Mexican-American mind.[4]

Another important influence on the Mexican-American generation was religion. Both Roman Catholic and Protestant denominations played influential roles. The Roman Catholic Church historically has been one of the most important institutions for Mexicans. Although Mexican-Americans were the primary supporters of the Catholic Church in the southwest after annexation it became an instrument for the Americanization of the Mexican population and for its subjugation to Anglo customs.[5] Americanization generally was implemented through the church's associations such as the Catholic Youth Organizations and its social centers. Mario Garcia argues that the Catholic Church played two roles in the Mexican-American community: it instilled American customs in Mexican individuals and it maintained their customs and traditions, including use of the Spanish language.[6]

Protestant denominations also played an important role in shaping the Mexican-American mind. Protestant individuals began preaching the word of a non-Catholic God during the mid-19th century throughout the southwest. By the turn of the century organized ventures to convert Mexican-Americans to Protestantism began in earnest. Running through these religious efforts was a steady dose of Americanization content.[7]

Education, both public and non-public, was another factor influencing the Mexican-American generation. Schools were probably the central institutions shaping the identity and consciousness of Mexican-Americans. They helped form their new identity as American citizens during the 1920s, imbued them with high ideals, and opened doors to immense economic opportunities which they did not think possible for members of

their race.

Formal school instruction for the Mexican-American Generation was an extremely positive one. This image of the public school is contrary to the one elucidated by educational historians. Historians, for instance, have argued that schools during the 20th century were exclusionary and discriminatory. This discrimination was most apparent in the establishment of segregated and inferior "Mexican" public schools.[8] Preliminary evidence from my research indicates that while schools were in many cases segregated they were not necessarily inferior. In some cases facilities for Mexican-Americans as well as teacher qualifications, experiences, and salaries were similar to those offered in the Anglo communities.[9]

Likewise while Mexican-Americans attended segregated schools many of them actually graduated from integrated public schools. Their attendance in secondary schools depended on many factors including the size of the Mexican-American population, the school district's willingness to provide educational opportunities, and the parents' determination for learning.[10]

Also, the schooling of Mexican-Americans did not take place only in public institutions. Like all other Americans they enrolled in parochial schools sponsored largely by Catholic and Protestant churches. The Catholic Church began to establish parochial schools for Mexicans during the early 1850s in California and later in other states. The Catholic Church in El Paso, for instance, established the Sacred Heart School in the Mexican community in 1892. Thirteen years later the St. Ignacius Church in the same city began operating a Catholic school for Mexicans. In order to accommodate its 600 student enrollment the Church built a new school in 1919 costing $30,000. This school contained eleven classrooms plus an auditorium and represented one of El Paso's most modern schools.[11]

The Catholic Church continued to establish parochial schools for Mexicans into the 20th century. In 1927, for example, the Los Angeles Archdiocese established Cathedral High School for Mexican children. The school, noted one of its alumni, "did a great job in educating us." Most of these children became professionals, businessmen and civil servants.[12]

The character, content, and consequences of these Catholic schools is unclear at this point. Were these schools established to help maintain the language and culture of the Mexican children or simply to teach English and American customs? How did the schools view the Mexican children's culture and Spanish language? These and other questions have yet to be systematically studied.

Protestant schools also were developed for Mexican children in the

southwest. Beginning in the early 1850s, Melinda Rankin opened a school for Mexican girls in south Texas that gave instruction in the regular academic subjects and also taught the Bible and the English language. The efforts to establish schools for Mexicans continued after the Civil War. In New Mexico, for example, day schools were developed in rural areas and boarding schools were established in some of the larger towns and cities. In 1870 Allison-James School for Mexican Girls was begun by Charity Ann Gaston in Santa Fe, New Mexico. It soon evolved into a boarding school and became co-educational by 1934. Menual Training School was established as a school for Mexican boys in 1871 in Mora, New Mexico. Years later, it was moved to Albuquerque. By 1888 the Presbyterians had established 24 Boarding and Day schools for Mexicans in New Mexico.[13]

Other Protestant denominations in addition to Presbyterians established schools for Mexican-Americans in different parts of the southwest. For example, in 1900 the Methodist Church developed the Frances De Pauw School in Los Angeles. In 1909 the Methodists developed plans for the Spanish American Industrial Training School for Mexican Boys and in 1913 it opened under the auspices of the Southern California Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church.[14]

Mclean, a prominent Protestant, estimated that approximately 38 schools for Mexicans were in operation in the southwest by 1930. Texas had 13, New Mexico had 16, Arizona had 1, and California had 8. The Episcopalians and the Methodists were the largest sponsors of these schools.[15]

The curriculum in most of these schools attended by members of the Mexican-American Generation was not imposing in character nor was it aimed at stamping out the cultural heritage of these children as most educational historians have argued.[16] The public and parochial schools attended by the Mexican-American Generation did have Americanization policies but they were benign in character and non-imposing in nature. Evidence from the schooling experiences of some Mexican-Americans indicates that they wanted to learn the English language and American customs. Individuals such as Raul Castro from Arizona for example even blamed the teacher for not teaching him how to speak English. The experiences of Ernesto Galarza in elementary school further supports the contention that the public schools he attended were not imposing Americanization upon him: he was actively engaged in learning the language and customs of his adopted country.[17]

While many schools probably denigrated the Mexican children's heritage evidence indicates that the schools attended by the members of the Mexican-American Generation respected their customs and attempted to utilize them in the schools. This is especially so in the parochial schools. The parochial schools shared the public school's goal

of Americanization but this was not accomplished at the expense of their language and culture. An example of this was the Spanish American institute in Los Angeles. Victor Almaraz a student at the Spanish American Institute from 1919 to 1923 recalled his daily experiences in that high school. According to him all the boys recited the Pledge of Allegiance before their breakfast and their assigned daily tasks on the school's farm or in the dormitory. The students lived at the institute where they were separated into dormitories according to their grade in school and were taught to care for themselves by a matron who was assigned to each dormitory.

The instructional aspect of the school, recalled Almaraz, focused on the basic skills, especially the learning of English. Some of the students took Spanish classes. Almaraz remembers taking courses in Mexican history. Cultural activities, many based on Mexican and Latin American as well as American customs, suppliemented the curriculum, as did social events with the girls from Frances de Pauw.[18]

Similar types of curricular activities were pursued in many of the public high schools attended by members of the Mexican-American Generation. Even in those cases where an active Americanization program existed there is no evidence of a conscious effort to demean the heritage of the Mexican child although it was believed that English should be substituted for Spanish in school life.

Educational historians likewise have argued that the school's curriculum taught Mexican-Americans simple vocational and social skills suitable for finding only non-skilled or semi-skilled jobs in the least dynamic sectors of the American economy. For all practical purposes, academic subject matter and cognitive skills development was deemphasized while vocational and manual arts training was strongly supported.[19] Evidence from the parochial and public schools attended by members of the Mexican-American Generation indicates that these arguments have to be reevaluated. Many of the secondary schools did provide vocational training for Mexican-Americans but much of this was aimed at providing special skills which these youngsters could use to move out of poverty. Printing, horticulture, photography, sheet metal, and carpentry were some of the most popular forms of vocational training during the 1920s for members of the Mexican-American Generation.[20]

In addition to vocational training, secondary schools also taught Mexican-Americans academic skills and moral values. Most importantly, it taught them to appreciate and practice such American political ideals as democracy and fairness in the schools. Citizenship was practiced and not merely taught. This was the case, for instance, at the Spanish American Institute. Almaraz recalled that he and others participated in the school's student government. This government was designed to teach the students how a city government and democracy operated in

the United States. Another student who attended SAI during the 1930s, Antonio Hernandez, remembers the student government as his introduction to the U.S. political system. After learning how to solicit votes, he ran for several offices, including Mayor of the student government.[21]

Private Mexican schools were also established throughout the southwest. Many of these schools used Spanish and taught Mexican history and culture. One author has noted that there were as many as six "little educational groups" that met privately in 1851 within the Mexican community of Los Angeles. During the latter part of the 1850s several other private Mexican schools were established in this city. T.S. Robert, Superintendent of Monterrey County Schools, noted that in 1860 the Mexican population in the area had two private schools taught in Spanish.[22]

Private Mexican schools were reported in other states. In Tucson, Arizona a school for Mexican boys was founded in 1868. Several Colorado communities, including Chama and San Francisco, reported private schools for Mexicans in 1876. Private schools for Mexicans were founded in Rosa, New Mexico at the turn of the century. During the school term, the teacher lived in the homes of each of the students.[23]

The first private Mexican school in Texas was established at Martin's Ranch near Isleta in 1871. In 1887, Aoy school was opened in El Paso. A decade later Colegio Altamirano was founded by the Mexican community in Hebronville. In 1906 the Colegio Preparatorio was founded in Laredo. The Escuela Particular was opened probably in 1909 in Zapata County. In July 1910 it held a public examination and fiesta escolar for the community. An additional private school taught by Professor Maria Renteria was opened in Laredo in 1911.[24]

During the latter part of the 1920s the Mexican Consul offices throughout the United States began to support the establishment of private Mexican schools. The primary purposes behind these efforts was to promote Mexican nationalism and to struggle against the "de-mexicanization" process encountered by children in American schools. Los Angeles led in the founding of these schools by the Mexican Consul. During the 1928-29 school year Margarita Robles reported seven private Mexican schools in operation in the Los Angeles and surrounding communities. Eight new schools were added the following year. By 1930, due to the lack of support among both public school officials and the Mexican communities these schools closed.[25]

It is unclear what specific role these private schools played in maintaining or promoting the identity of the Mexican-American Generation. Some of them such as the Aoy school in El Paso were established to teach the Mexican children English in order for them to enroll in the public schools. Others taught only Spanish in an effort to help maintain the

language and culture of Mexico. More research needs to be done in this area before any generalizations can be made.

Members of the Mexican-American Generation did not end their education once they completed elementary and secondary school. Many enrolled and graduated from colleges and universities; some went on to graduate or professional schools. The most prominent of these individuals were George I. Sanchez (Ph.D., 1934), Ernesto Galarza (Ph.D., 1935), and Carlos Castaneda (Ph.D., 1934). As might be expected little is known of their college experiences. Evidence though has emerged indicating that the Protestant denominations, especially in California encouraged Mexican-Americans to attend college and financially assisted them once they enrolled.[26] While in these colleges it is very possible that their dual identity and new consciousness was crystallized. Evidence exists, for instance, indicating that Mexican-Americans formed associations to promote their cultural and social traditions within the university. The establishment of the Mexican-American Movement in California, the first organization of Mexican-American college students during the 1930s is an example of this.

Those attending college became successful in their chosen occupations and upon returning to the community became actively involved in local, state, and national affairs. In many ways, members of the Mexican-American Generation were brown Horatio Algers — men and women of Mexican descent who personally overcame tremendous obstacles of poverty, ignorance, and prejudice and became successful in their occupations. As a result of their successes and sensitive to the poverty of their community they became actively involved in promoting the further integration of Mexican-Americans into the American mainstream.

Summary

In summary, I have argued that the 1920s was the formative period for the Mexican-American Generation and that schools in conjunction with other social forces played an important role in the lives of these individuals. These institutions contributed to the formation of the Mexican-Americans new identity as American citizens during the 1920s, imbued them with high ideals, and opened doors to immense economic opportunities which they did not think possible for members of their race.

Notes

[1] Jose A. Hernandez, *Mutual Aid for Survival* (Malabar, Florida: Robert E. Krieger Publishing Company, 1983); Julie Leininger, "La Raza Organizes: Mexican-American Life in San Antonio, 1915-1930, As Reflected in Mutualista Activities," Ph.D. Diss., University of Notre Dame, 1979; Richard A. Garcia, "The Mexican-American Mind: A Product of the 1930s," in National Association for Chicano Studies, *History, Culture, and Society: Chicano Studies in the 1980s* (Ypsilanti, Mich.: Bilingual Press, 1983): 67-93.

[2] R. Garcia, "The Mexican-American Mind," 1983: 79; Richard A. Garcia, "Class, Consciousness, and Ideology: A Study of the Mexican Community, 1930-1945," *Aztlan*, 9 (Fall, 1978): 23-69; Guadalupe San Miguel, Jr., "The Struggle Against Separate and Unequal Schools," *History of Education Quarter*, 23 (Fall, 1983): 343-359.

[3] For a seminal discussion of the role that institutional forces as well as socialization practices had on promoting the dual consciousness of the Mexican-American community in one city during the 1920s and 1930s see Garcia, 1983.

[4] Antony Quinn, *The Original Sin*, (New York: Bantam Books, Inc., 1972); Ernesto Galarza, *Barrio Boy*, (New York: Ballantine Books, 1971).

[5] Leonard Pitt, *The Decline of the Californios: A Social History of the Spanish-speaking Californians, 1846-1890* (Los Angeles, CA.: University of California Press, 1966): 210.

[6] Mario Garcia, *Desert Immigrants: The Mexicans of El Paso, 1880-1930* (New Haven, CT.: Yale University Press, 1981): 212-219.

[7] R. Douglas Brackenridge and Francisco O. Garcia-Treco, *Iglesia Presbiteriana: A History of Presbyterians and Mexican-Americans in the Southwest* (San Antonio, TX.: Trinity University Press, 1974).

[8] See, for instance, Meyer Weinberg, *A Chance to Learn: The History of Race and Education in the United States* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977): 140-177; Gilbert G. Gonzalez, "Segregation of Mexican Children in a Southern California City: The Legacy of Expansionism and the American Southwest," *The Western Historical Quarterly* (Jan., 1985): 55-76; Guadalupe San Miguel, Jr., "The Origins, Development and Consequences of the Educational Segregation of Mexicans in the Southwest," in Gene Garcia, Isidro Ortiz, and Francisco Lomeli, eds., *Contemporary Issues in Chicano Studies: A Multidisciplinary Approach* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1984): 195-208.

[9] See for instance, the comparative data on qualifications and wages of teachers in the Texas "Mexican" schools for the 1928-1929 school year provided by Herschel T. Manuel, *The Education of Spanish-speaking Children in Texas* (Austin: The University of Texas Press, 1930): 65-66.

[10] Paul S. Taylor, *An American-Mexican Frontier: Nueces County, Texas* (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 1934): 191-214; H.T. Manuel, *The Education of Spanish-speaking Children in Texas*, 1930, 68-82.

[11] M. Garcia, *Desert Immigrants*, 1981, 216.

[12] See "Cathedral High Backers Sue L.A. Archdiocese to Halt School Sale," *LA Times*, May 1, 1985, Part II:1 and 6, for efforts to save school from being sold to Hong Kong developer for 11.5 million.

[13] Melinda Rankin, *Twenty Years Among the Mexicans: A Narrative of Missionary Labor* (Cincinnati: Central Book Concern, 1881); John C. Rayburn, "Introduction," in Melinda Rankin, *Texas in 1850* (Waco, Texas: Texian Press, 1966): iii-xxiii; Francisco Hernandez, "Mexican Schools in the Southwest," unpublished paper, n.d. In author's possession. My appreciation is extended here to Dr. Francisco Hernandez for graciously allowing me access to his own personal research on the "Mexican Schools" of the southwest and for sharing with me his unpublished paper on these schools.

[14] F. Hernandez, "Mexican Schools," 4-6. See also the 58th Anniversary issue of the SAI entitled *Spanish American Institute: 1913-1971, Service to Boys* (Gardena, Ca.: SAI, 1971).

[15] Robert N. Mclean, *The Northern Mexican* (New York: Home Missions Council, 1929): 43.

[16] See, for example, M. Garcia, *Desert Immigrants*, 1981: 110-126; T. Carter and R. Segura, *Mexican Americans in School*, 1979; Meyer Weinberg, *A Chance to Learn*, 1979.

[17] Geoffrey P. Mawn, "Raul Hector Castro: Poverty to Prominence," in Manuel P. Servin, ed., *An Awakening Minority: The Mexican-Americans* (Beverly Hills, CA.: Glencoe Press, 1974): 295-309; Ernesto Galarza, *Barrio Boy*, 1971. For a sensitive biography of a member of the Mexican-American Generation see Felix D. Almaraz, Jr., "Carlos Eduardo Castaneda, Mexican-American Historian: The Formative Years, 1896-1927," in Norris Hundley, Jr., ed., *The Chicano* (Santa Barbara, CA: Clio Press, Inc., 1970): 57-72.

[18] F. Hernandez, "Mexican Schools," n.d., 7-8.

[19] See, for instance, Gilbert G. Gonzalez, "Racism, Education, and the Mexican Community in Los Angeles, 1920-1930," *Societas*, 4 (Autumn, 1974): 287-301; Gilbert G. Gonzalez, "Educational Reform in Los Angeles and Its Effects Upon the Mexican Community, 1900-1930," *Explorations in Ethnic Studies* 1 (July, 1978): 5-26; M. Garcia, *Desert Immigrants*, 1981, 110-126; Thomas Simmons, "The Citizen Factories: The Americanization of Mexican Students in the Texas Public Schools, 1920-1945," Ph.D. diss., Texas A & M, 1976.

[20] James O. Loflin, "Mexican Secondary Education in the Sidney Lanier Junior School of S.A., Texas," M.A. Thesis, Colorado State College, Ft. Collins,

Colorado, 1927; R. Maclean, 1929.

[21] F. Hernandez, "Mexican Schools," n.d., 8.

[22] F. Hernandez, "Mexican Schools," n.d., 20.

[23] F. Hernandez, "Mexican Schools," n.d., 20-21.

[24] F. Hernandez, "Mexican Schools," n.d., 22-23.

[25] James Cameron, "A History of Mexican Education in Los Angeles, 1910-1930," Ph.D. diss., University of Southern California, 1971.

[26] R.D. Brackenridge and F.O. Garcia-Treco, *Iglesia Presbiteriana*, 1974.

Part IV
CLASSICAL IDEAS IN THEORY AND PRACTICE

ORATORY AS CONDUCT IN CICERO AND QUINTILIAN

J.J. Chambliss,
Rutgers University

The general aim is to explore the conception of oratory shared by Cicero and Quintilian. The particular aim is to emphasize the sense in which they take oratory not only to be *grounded* in human conduct, but to *be* a kind of conduct. While Quintilian does not agree with certain features of Cicero's conception of oratory, the ground they share in common is more extensive and more important than their differences.

Cicero called Isocrates "the Master of all rhetoricians, from whose school, as from the Horse of Troy, none but leaders emerged."[1] In Cicero we find a continuation of the Greek tradition in poetry and oratory that one must be educated in right conduct and in good speech. The influence of Aristotelian ideas is brought to bear in Cicero's argument that orator and philosopher combined make the best orator.

We may begin with Cicero's description of an orator at work: "In an orator we must demand the subtlety of the logician, the thoughts of the philosopher, a diction almost poetic, a lawyer's memory, a tragedian's voice, and the bearing almost of the consummate actor."[2] A "finished orator" is a rare bird. "No rarer thing . . . can be discovered among the sons of men," Cicero writes.[3] The great orators have the sense that, even with nature's gifts, with practice, and with great striving, what the orator wants may be different from what he gets. "Those [most eminent orators] who had learned from experience and knowledge of human nature understood that . . . the fate of a speech was sometimes not sufficiently in accordance with their wish."[4] Thus wide experience and considerable knowledge are necessary if one is to become a good orator; yet they are clearly not sufficient to make him successful. Cicero comes close to echoing the ancient wisdom in the famous line of Aeschylus: "Man must suffer to be wise."[5] For Cicero, the good orator is the kind of wise man who will suffer from the uncertainty that is a consequence of his wisdom.

The idea that the education of an orator is an education in right conduct is a continuing theme in Cicero's *De Oratore*. Not only is it implicit in much that Cicero says, but it is made explicit in two ways. First, in certain references to poetry and history which characterize the orator as a man of action; and, second, in his discussions of the relationships between the art of oratory and the knowledge needed by an orator. As an example of the first, Cicero recalls the story of Phoenix and young Achilles in Homer's *Iliad*, quoting the passage in which Phoenix says that he had been charged with making Achilles "an orator and man of

action too."[6] The point of the story is that it reminds us that "in old days . . . the same system of instruction seems to have imparted education both in right conduct and in good speech."[7] As an example of the second, Cicero says that Aristotle is a fine philosopher for students of oratory to read. It was he who not only "put the whole of his system of philosophy in a polished and brilliant form," but also "linked the scientific study of facts with practice in style."[8] This is why Philip asked Aristotle to be Alexander's tutor, Cicero goes on, "to impart to him the principles both of conduct and of oratory."[9] Cicero takes care to emphasize the importance of the orator "possessing wisdom combined with eloquence,"[10] saying that "the prize must go to the orator who possesses learning."[11] Cicero argues against separating the education of the orator from that of the philosopher.[12] He thought it was the teachings of Socrates which "separated the science of wise thinking from that of elegant speaking, though in reality they are closely linked together."[13] Cicero goes on to say that Socrates' teachings are the source of "the undoubtedly absurd and unprofitable and reprehensible severance between the tongue and the brain."[14] As a consequence, he argues, we have one set of teachers to teach us to think and another set to teach us to speak. It is obvious that Cicero wants thinking and speaking to be twin attributes of the orator (or of the orator-philosopher, which is what he thinks an orator should be).

Oratory is not a skill which can be learned by merely learning the rules of the rhetoricians. Rather it is closer to a way of being in the world: the orator celebrates an ideal of excellence by means of the orations he creates on the strength of wide knowledge and large experience. "The genuine orator," Cicero writes, "must have investigated and heard and read and discussed and handled and debated the whole of the life of mankind, inasmuch as that is the field of the orator's activity, the subject matter of his study."[15] The clear suggestion here is that the orator, giving voice to the oration that he has created, must be in command of much more than "the *principles* of conduct and oratory," which Phoenix tried to teach Achilles, and which Philip wanted for Alexander. What the orator must do is test the meaning of those principles in his attempts to persuade. Striving to give "verbal expression to the thoughts and purposes of the mind in such a manner as to have the power of driving the hearers forward in any direction in which it has applied its weight,"[16] is the practical aim of the orator. At this point the relationship between the potential power of the orator and the virtues possessed by the orator becomes clear. It is necessary for the power to be combined with "integrity and supreme wisdom," Cicero points out, "and if we bestow fluency of speech on persons devoid of those virtues, we shall have put weapons into the hands of madmen."[17] Here is Cicero's statement of the classic conception of the orator as "the good man speaking well," espoused before him by Isocrates, and to be praised later by Quintilian. At the same time, it is the orator's answer to Socrates' criticism of rhetoric in the *Gorgias*. As we have seen, Cicero's orator is a philosopher

no less than he is an orator. Better put, unless he is a philosopher of a certain kind he cannot be an orator of substance. "For my part," Cicero writes, "my present inquiry is not which system of philosophy is the truest but which is the most fully akin to the orator."[18]

It is important to notice at this point that Cicero is not saying that "truth" has no place in oratory; rather he appears to have taken from Aristotle the idea that orators are like statesmen in that they work with probabilities rather than with certainties. They work with what Aristotle calls "actions done" (as well as those remaining to be done), whose subject matter "admits of variation."[19] He praises the "older masters" before Socrates who "used to combine with their theory of rhetoric the whole of the study and the science of everything that concerns morals and conduct and ethics and politics."[20] This is the "study and science" of those subject matters that belong to Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* and *Politics*. The way to become an orator lies in the "close alliance between oratory and philosophy,"[21] and for this the orator needs "width of culture."[22]

We need to make clearer the sense in which Cicero's orator is one who has studied the subject matters taken into account in Aristotle's ethical-political writings. He also is one who, like Aristotle, understands that "in doing the end cannot be other than the act itself: doing well is in itself the end."[23] We need to see that the orator not only understands this, but also conducts himself in such a way that he strives to do well. Put differently, the claim is that Cicero's orator must understand human experience in ways so that he can speak persuasively, and at the same time, be the kind of person who employs his orations to improve his own conduct as a member of a community of human beings in action.

The art of oratory is concerned with what is shared by human beings, "with the common practice, custom, and speech of mankind."[24] Indeed, Cicero claims that it is a serious mistake to depart from the language of everyday life and from "the usage approved by the sense of the community."[25] This is why Cicero finds that Aristotle's "commonplaces" are useful to an orator. For Cicero, Aristotle's commonplaces are "common" in the sense that they are the "places" around which human beings of experience gather in common, and "among which every line of argument might be found."[26] Commonplaces stand for the sense of the community, a sense that is based on the wisest and best the culture has brought to pass in its history. At the same time, what is common is the basis for "every line of argument." As Cicero sees Aristotle's commonplaces they are "what is known to us," rather than what is "knowable in itself," to use Aristotle's language.[27] As in Aristotle's student of ethics-politics, so in Cicero's student of oratory: "It is from knowledge that oratory must derive its beauty and fullness,"[28] yet oratory is not "within the grasp of exact knowledge."[29]

In his own way, then, Cicero is telling us that oratory belongs to the class of things which Aristotle called "variable things" rather than to the class of things Aristotle called "scientific knowledge."[30] Cicero's orator must have had experience of a certain kind in order to find commonplaces that are useful. If the orator "is a stranger to social intercourse, precedent, tradition, and the manners and disposition of his fellow-countrymen, those commonplaces from which proofs are derived will avail him but little."[31] This is perhaps where Cicero comes closest to acknowledging the wisdom of Aristotle's idea that the man of principles acts not only by *conforming* to right principle, but by *cooperating* with right principle.[32] In any case, the right principles with which one may cooperate are to be found in our commonplaces, and only the person who has had the experience for which the commonplaces stand is capable of cooperating. The experience gained through striving is the context in which the orator tests his worth. Certain powers are "gifts of nature,"[33] and cannot be derived from art. While holding that "good abilities may through instruction become better," there are others so lacking in natural gifts that they "cannot enter the ranks of the orators."[34]

The ancient wisdom that had moved Plato to say that one gets virtue by divine dispensation[35] is acknowledged by Cicero: "Others there are . . . so completely furnished with the bounty of nature, as to seem of more than human birth, and to have been shaped by some divinity."[36] The kinship among natural talent, long experience in both the life and the studies which concern morals and conduct in one's community, and the commonplaces, is a necessary one: What the naturally gifted orator writes and speaks comes to one who has had a certain experience of life and study; and what he writes and speaks will *be* the "places" common to the community in which he has had the experience. Cicero puts it this way: "The truth is that all the commonplaces, whether furnished by art or by individual talent and wisdom . . . appear and rush forward as we are searching out and surveying the matter with all our natural acuteness."[37] The need for the orator to give expression to the best that has been experienced by members of a community which prizes certain things in common is discussed in another passage where Cicero says that the rules of the art of eloquence which are taught by professors of rhetoric are a help towards right knowledge.[38] There he says that "certain persons have noted and collected the doings of men who were naturally eloquent: thus eloquence is not the offspring of the art, but the art of eloquence."[39]

Cicero emphasizes the importance of human conduct as the ground from which commonplaces originate, and their use in the education of the orator who needs not only to study past conduct, but to learn how to conduct himself and to persuade others to conduct themselves in certain ways. It is worth noting that Cicero points to the *doings* of eloquent men, not just their *sayings*. Thus, clearly, the origins of an orator's subject matter are to be found in human conduct, and the consequences of an orator's gifts, experience, and performance must *be* conduct of certain

kinds. Cicero knows of the need for investigation, for taking the conduct of philosophers and of those practiced in statecraft as the context in which commonplaces are determined. For another reason the education and the conduct of an orator need to be a continuing investigation: This is the unknown fate of one's oration, which Cicero expresses as a kind of humility in the midst of uncertainty.[40] In this he has something in common with Plato's philosopher-charioteer who seeks true knowledge but finds his steeds lamed and broken-winged, and learns that he must settle for semblance of Truth.[41] He also shares the wisdom that one swallow does not make Spring[42] with Aristotle's practitioner of statecraft.

In Quintilian's *Institutes of Oratory*, attention is paid to the idea that the conduct celebrated in great poetry and advocated in great oratory is both the ground and the aim sought in the education of an orator. The idea that the education of an orator is an education in conduct is Quintilian's no less than it is Cicero's. Quintilian's awe of the ancients is made obvious in his discussion of language:

> A certain majesty, and, if I may so express myself, religion, graces the antique. Authority is commonly sought in orators or historians . . . . Custom . . . . is the surest preceptor in speaking; and we must use phraseology, like money, which has the public stamp.[43]

In the preface to his work, he recalls the classic idea that the orator "cannot exist unless as a good man." And in the final Book, he insists that "an orator, then, is a good man."[44] Quintilian is dedicated to the idea that the customs of conventional wisdom (his counterpart of Cicero's commonplaces), are the basis for a sound education. "Custom in speaking, therefore, I shall call the agreement of the educated; as I call custom in living the agreement of the good."[45] Like Cicero, he too recalls Homer's Phoenix, a master who was "excellent as well in eloquence as in morals: one who . . . may teach his pupil at once to speak and to act."[46] Yet Quintilian realized that one's studies are necessary, but far from sufficient, conditions of his education.

Choosing nurses whose morality is beyond reproach should be an essential responsibility of a child's father, Quintilian writes. The child's nurses should not be allowed to speak in ungrammatical ways, although "to their morals, doubtless, attention is first to be paid."[47] This attention to children's morals aims to make a difference in the adult orator. He characterizes the "perfect orator" as "a thinker of the best thoughts and a speaker of the best language,"[48] and likens him to the fearless orator imagined by Virgil in addressing an angry populace, when "With words / He rules their passions and their breasts controls."[49] Here we have "a good man," Quintilian says, "skilled in speaking."[50]

Quintilian agrees with Cicero that the study of dialectic is useful in the

education of an orator. Yet the moral part of philosophy is more important. It is not merely to understand these things that we study them, Quintilian says. Virtues such as justice, courage, temperance, and self-control are to be known not "by sound and name only." Rather, they are to be known by being *lived*. The true orator, "who has embraced them in his heart, and thinks in conformity with them, will have no difficulty in conceiving proper notions about them, and will express sincerely what he thinks."[51] What is more, Quintilian assures his readers that the orator need not commit himself to any specific philosophic sect; what the orator strives for "is of a loftier and better nature, since he is to be distinguished as well by excellence of moral conduct as by merit in eloquence."[52]

Quintilian puts us in mind of Cicero's claim that commonplaces give expression to a conduct of a certain kind from which and for which orators speak, in writing that it is essential for an orator "to bear continually in mind, the noble deeds and sayings which are recorded of the great men of antiquity."[53] And the commonplaces may be less than true: like the assertions made in Aristotle's study of statecraft, they "admit of variation." As Quintilian puts it, "oratory does not always purpose to say what is true, but does always purpose to say what is like truth."[54] There is a sense of Cicero's uncertainty about the consequences of an oration in Quintilian's urging us to "aspire to the highest excellence,"[55] even though Quintilian refuses to promise that we shall become the best. He claims only that "we shall either attain the summit, or at least see many below us."[56] The thing for human beings to do is to strive for the best. Above all, it is necessary to do this, even though there is no promise of victory.

In fact, Quintilian argues that the widely-held idea, that the object of oratory is to persuade, is an inadequate one.[57] To persuade, Quintilian says, is an aim not confined to orators. For example, money "has the power of persuasion," as does a beautiful person, or a "pitiable appearance."[58] "Oratory," he insists, "is the art of speaking well."[59] And, if this is the case, Quintilian continues, the ultimate end of oratory "must be to speak well."[60] To give this conception of oratory a context, Quintilian again reminds his readers that "a true orator must be, above all, a good man."[61] Thus art and morality are joined in the mind and character of the orator and in the oration that he produces.

In one passage, Quintilian writes of three divisions of rhetoric: art, artist, and the work.[62] The art is the know-how of speaking well; the artist is the orator who has acquired the art; and the work is good speaking. Against those who argue that the end of art is to persuade, Quintilian insists that speaking well does not require victory to attain the end of the art. "So it is the object of an orator to speak well," he holds, "for his art . . . consists in the *act*, and not in the result."[63] As in Cicero, there is no promise of victory for the true orator.

In one sense, then, an oration is a work of art. It is something produced, as a painting. Orations are written down, and sometimes published. Yet, for Quintilian, the orator is more like a dancer than a painter. In distinguishing among the kinds of arts, Quintilian refers to: (1) the theoretic, "such as *astronomy*, which requires no *act*, but is confined to a mere understanding of the matters that form the subject of it"; (2) the practic, whose object "lies in the act, and is fulfilled in it, leaving nothing produced from it . . . as *dancing*"; (3) the productive, "which attain their end in the execution of the work which is submitted to the eye . . . as painting."[64] Quintilian holds that oratory partakes of the theoretic, as when the orator restricts himself to contemplation; here he says that "the pleasure derived from knowledge is pure when it is withdrawn from action . . . and enjoys the calm contemplation of itself."[65] He holds, also, that oratory is similar to a productive art in the written speeches and historical compositions it produces.[66] Even so, "as its performance consists chiefly in the mere act, and as it is most frequently exhibited *in act*, [let it] be called an *active*, or a *practical* art."[67] In the passage where oratory is likened more to dancing than to painting or astronomy, Quintilian again emphasizes the sense that oratory is a kind of art whose nature is action: "*oratory* consists in act, for it accomplishes in the act all that it has to do."[68]

Now we can see that, in an even more striking way for Quintilian than for Cicero, the activity of the orator is intimately connected to the oration produced. True oratory is a kind of action whose integrity consists of art-artist-oration so tightly woven together that it is possible to distinguish among them but not to separate them in action. Perhaps Quintilian's sense of oratory as a kind of action, rather than a set of skills or a complex technical apparatus, is not well known to students of history of education because most discussions of Roman oratory emphasize the details of the curriculum in the education of an orator, pointing to its dependence on a written literature of poetry, history, and oratory. Of course Quintilian did not neglect the curriculum in his *Institutes*; in fact, that work is one of the most-quoted sources used by historians in reconstructing the education of an orator in Ancient Rome.[69]

In emphasizing Quintilian's conception of oratory as an active art, we are simply making plain two ideas that give more specific meaning to our earlier discussion of the true orator as the "good man speaking well." (1) The subject matters which contain the main body of commonplaces are, at best, *means* to the education of an orator, not ends-in-themselves. (2) This means that commonplaces become active in the education of an orator when they enter into the orator's life, when they become essential to his action rather than merely to his understanding and to his "productions." In this sense, orations produced in action are a part *of* the action. Even though they may be written down and published, and may be used as examples providing commonplaces for orators-in-training, their distinguishing feature is the kind of act they are. Remember that in the act is

its necessity. "[Oratory] accomplishes in the act all that it has to do."[70] The quality and meaning of the life the orator has lived and is living are expressed in the oration. Nothing else is needed for the good man, not even success in persuading those who hear the oration. Now this is a far thing from the conception of an orator merely as pleader, defender, persuader, or sophist. Rather, the oration is the test of the meaning of the orator's life. The very quality of an orator's existence is made public in the attempt to speak well.

With this conception of oratory before us, we can see that Quintilian's assertion that the oratory which he tries to teach "must be regarded as a *virtue*"[71] is another way of characterizing the art. Quintilian has in mind the classic idea of virtue, that there is a kind of action which excels in the conduct that is peculiar to each species of creature, e.g., swiftness in the racehorse, strength in the lion. Man excels in two kinds of conduct, Quintilian holds: eloquence and reason.[72] Of course the two are related; for Quintilian as for Cicero, the true orator is a philosopher as well. Put differently, oratory is a virtue, a way of conduct by which the good man unites eloquence and reason.

It is important to understand that Quintilian is not saying merely that the true orator *knows* virtues such as justice, courage, temperance, and self-control. While it is the case that the quality of oratory is enhanced when the orator possesses these virtues, Quintilian wants to make a further and more important claim: oratory itself *is* a virtue. In putting it this way Quintilian simply wants to say that, as an art, oratory is itself a way of life. Oratory is not a "bag of virtues." It is the virtue by which we strive to integrate eloquence and reason in such a way that we do justice to the best in our nature.

Notes

[1] *De Oratore*. II. xxii. 94. Translated by E.W. Sutton and H. Rackham, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard U. Press, 1967).

[2] *Ibid*. I. xxviii. 128.

[3] *Ibid*.

[4] *Ibid*. I. xxvii. 123. Cf. I. xxvi. 120: "The better the orator, the more profoundly is he frightened of the difficulty of speaking, and of the doubtful fate of a speech, and of the anticipations of an audience."

[5] *Agamemnon*. 179. Translated by Philip Vellacott. *The Oresteian Trilogy* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1967), p. 48.

[6] *De Oratore*. III. xv. 57. Translated by H. Rackham, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard U. Press, 1968).

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] *Ibid.* III. xxxiv. 141.

[9] *Ibid.*

[10] *Ibid.* III. xxxv. 142.

[11] *Ibid.* III. xxxv. 143.

[12] *Ibid.*

[13] *Ibid.* III. xvi. 60.

[14] *Ibid.* III. xvi. 61.

[15] *Ibid.* III. xiv. 54-55.

[16] *Ibid.* III. xiv. 55.

[17] *Ibid.* III. xvi. 56.

[18] *Ibid.* III. xvii. 64. Cf. I. xii. 60. There Cicero insists that an orator must make "a most careful search into all those theories respecting the natural characters and the habits and conduct of mankind."

[19] *Nicomachean Ethics*. VI. 4. 1140a1-2.

[20] *De Oratore*. III. xix. 72.

[21] *Ibid.* III. xix. 73.

[22] *Ibid.* III. xxi. 80.

[23] *Nicomachean Ethics*. VI. 5. 1140b4-5.

[24] *De Oratore*. I. iii. 12.

[25] *Ibid.*

[26] *Ibid.* II. xxxvi. 152.

[27] For Aristotle, what is "knowable in itself" comes, if at all, at the end of our investigations. At the beginning of our investigations, however, we must make do with what is "known to us," which is known as a consequence of our history together. It is what we know because of our experience in common. See *Nicomachean Ethics*. I. 4. 1095b2-3.

[28] *De Oratore*. I. vi. 20.

[29] *Ibid.* I. xxiii. 108.

[50] For Aristotle, scientific knowledge is demonstrative knowledge, whose objects exist by necessity, rather than by human action. *Nicomachean Ethics*. VI. 3. 1139b23, 31.

[51] *De Oratore*. II. xxx. 131.

[52] *Cooperating* emphasizes the need for deliberately principled conduct, rather than conduct which might "happen" to *conform* to principle. See *Nicomachean Ethics*. VI. 13. 1144b27-28.

[53] *De Oratore*. I. xxv. 114.

[54] *Ibid*. I. xxv. 115.

[55] See Plato's *Meno*, 99e, 100b.

[56] *De Oratore*. I. xxv. 115.

[57] *Ibid*. I. xxxiii. 151.

[58] *Ibid*. I. xxxii. 146-47.

[59] *Ibid*. I. xxxii. 146.

[60] *Ibid*. I. xxvi. 120, and I. xxvi. 123.

[61] Plato's *Phaedrus*, 248a-b.

[62] *Nicomachean Ethics*. I. 7. 1098a13-20.

[63] Quintilian's *Institutes of Oratory*. I. vi. 1-3. Translated by John Selby Watson (London: George Bell and Sons, 1875).

[64] *Ibid*. Preface. 9. Cf. XII. ii. 1.

[65] *Ibid*. I. vi. 45.

[66] *Ibid*. II. iii. 12.

[68] *Ibid*. XII. i. 25.

[69] *Ibid*. XII. i. 27.

[70] *Ibid*.

[71] *Ibid*. XII. ii. 17.

[72] *Ibid*. XII. ii. 27.

[73] *Ibid*. XII. ii. 29.

[74] *Ibid*. II. xvii. 39.

[55] *Ibid.* XII. xi. 80.

[56] *Ibid.*

[57] *Ibid.* II. xv. 3-14.

[58] *Ibid.* II. xv. 6.

[59] *Ibid.* II. xv. 38.

[60] *Ibid.*

[61] *Ibid.* II. xvi. 11.

[62] *Ibid.* II. xiv. 4.

[63] *Ibid.* II. xvii. 25.

[64] *Ibid.* II. xviii. 2.

[65] *Ibid.* II. xviii. 4.

[66] *Ibid.* II. xviii. 5.

[67] *Ibid.*

[68] *Ibid.* II. xviii. 2.

[69] Stanley F. Bonner, in the Preface to his *Education in Ancient Rome* (Berkeley, U. of California Press, 1977), acknowledges a special indebtedness to Quintilian. And in a chapter called "Learning the Art of the Advocate," Quintilian's *Institutes* is mentioned in 112 of 142 notes.

[70] *Institutes of Oratory*, II. xviii. 2.

[71] *Ibid.* II. xx. 4.

[72] *Ibid.* II. xx. 9.

LOYOLA AND THE JESUITS: MASTERS OF EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT, METHOD, AND TEACHER PREPARATION

George Arakapadavil
Illinois State University

Introduction

The educational scheme that Loyola and the Jesuits developed stands out as one of the most important and influential reforms during the later phase of the Renaissance. In the context of the current concerns with educational reforms, the topic of Loyola and the Jesuits is very significant and insightful on some of the issues connected with reforms. In this connection, three main areas among the many contributions that the Jesuits have made to education will be examined. These are: 1) educational organization and management, 2) method of teaching, and 3) teacher preparation. In order to provide a proper context for a discussion of these areas, it is necessary to briefly examine how the Jesuit system of education was developed and add a note about the primary sources.

The educational aims of the Jesuits were inspired by religious fervor and zeal to glorify God by reforming the morals of society in general and remedying the ignorance of clergy in particular. The movement was not set up for instruction originally, but training of leaders became a necessity as the society helped to lead the Counter Reformation. The movement needed leaders who could counter the Reformation on intellectual as well as religious grounds. Therefore, the Society of Jesus placed education highest on its list of activities. Loyola assumed the education of youth to be a special means of obtaining the ends of his society. This humanistic education grew into the most comprehensive school system in Europe, and continued to dominate secondary school training until approximately 1850. The Protestant Francis Bacon (1605) was so impressed with the educational system of the Jesuits that he remarked: "They are so good that I wish they were on our side."

Our knowledge about the educational system that Loyola and the Jesuits developed is contained in two main sources: *The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus* (1554) and the *Ratio atque institutio studiorum societatis Jesu* (1599), usually referred to as Ratio Studiorum or Plan of Studies. *The Constitutions* consist of ten parts, covering such areas as admission and acceptance of applicants, the spiritual and educational care of the novices, and the government of the Order. Almost half the length of the *Constitutions* is in the fourth part and is concerned with the instruction in literature and other studies of those who remain in the

Society after the years of probation (novitiate). Of the seventeen chapters in part IV of the *Constitutions*, the first ten chapters deal with the organization and management of the colleges, the remaining seven deal with the universities of the Society.

The *Ratio Studiorum*, a document of 30 chapters, expanded in detail the broad prescriptions contained in part IV of the *Constitutions*. When the first draft was completed in 1584 by a group of skilled educators, it was circulated among Jesuit schools and colleges around the world with instructions to try it out over a period of time and report the findings to the central office. After several revisions incorporating the comments and criticisms received in the light of actual classroom experience, the final draft was issued in 1599. The *Ratio*, no doubt, reflects one of the most systematic, scientific, and rigorous educational reforms ever undertaken. Rusk (1982) remarked:

> So comprehensive, systematic and exhaustive are the regulations that the modern reader is inclined to forget that the *Ratio Studiorum* is one of the first attempts on record at educational organization, management, and method, at a time when it was unusual even to grade pupils in classes, and one is tempted to compare it, not always to the disadvantage of the *Ratio*, with the regulations of a modern school system which have only after some generations been evolved and perfected (p. 54).

The *Ratio* contains detailed instructions and guidelines concerning educational goals of the Order, course of study, educational administration, method of teaching, discipline, and the preparation of teachers.

1. *Educational Organization and Management*

The Jesuit educational system was organized in terms of two types of colleges or levels of instruction, the lower college (studia inferiora) and the higher college (studia superiora). The lower college, which generally began at age 12 and usually lasted five or six years, included the study of three grammar classes, followed by a class of humanities and a class of rhetoric. At the completion of studies at the lower college, one would be able to pursue studies at the higher college. At the higher level, philosophy, including mathematics and natural science, was studied for a period of three years. An additional four years of theology will be pursued by those seeking admission to the society and be ordained priests.

The *Ratio* contained specific rules and regulations concerning the duties of various officials in the organizational hierarchy of the Order. The head of the Order was the General. The world was divided into Provinces. The Provincial, appointed by the General, came next in the line of authority, followed by Rectors of colleges, Prefets of studies and discipline, and the Professors. The *Ratio* specified as well as provided guidelines on every aspect of educational administration. For instance,

there were specific guidelines for decision making on matters relating to enrollment, progress, discipline, examinations, prayers, school decorum, awarding of prizes, the fixing of holidays and so on.

II. *Method of Teaching*

The Ratio dealt extensively with the method of teaching. The Jesuits subscribed to the idea that "unless a ready and true method be adopted much labor is spent in gathering little fruit." Thus the Jesuits were led to establish a uniform and universal method of teaching in the *Ratio*. Every aspect relating to instruction was so clearly laid down in the *Ratio*. It also prescribed a variety of instructional methods such as Praelectio, Repetitio, Concertatio, as well as various other positive and negative reinforcements.

A. *The Method of Praelectio* (prelection) was a major part of the school instruction. Combining lecture and explanation, the teacher studied the assignment aloud in front of the class. Apart from this general characteristic of prelection, there were considerable variations in prelection in relation to the levels of the curriculum. For instance, at the three lower levels, which involved the study of Latin and Greek grammar, the prelection involved translation of passages, explanation of the grammatical structures of each sentence in the passage, as well as analysis of subjects, predicates, modifiers and the like. At the higher level, the artistic structure of the passage was analyzed and interpreted, often using materials from related disciplines such as history, mythology and so on to corroborate the informations and principles contained in the passage studied.

B. *Repetitio*. The *Ratio* also emphasized the necessity for constant repetition. Every part of instruction was reviewed directly after its completion. Every lesson was connected with two repetitions — one before it began, of preceding work, and the other at the close, of the work just completed. Besides this, one day a week, usually Saturdays, was devoted entirely to repetition. In the three lower classes the second six months in the year repeated the work of the first six months. The practice of repetition was based on the assumption that "what is repeated is more likely to be impressed on the mind." Moreover, this practice also allowed those with exceptional talents to be promoted after a single term. Thus boys with extraordinary ability could pass through the three elementary levels in eighteen months, instead of three years.

C. *Concertatio* (rivalry) as a mode of motivation for excellence was instituted by the Jesuit school masters between members of the class as well as between groups within classes. Individual rank as well as one's team success depended on the alertness and adequate preparation for each lesson. *Ratio* pointed out that:

> the Concertatio which is usually conducted by the questions of masters or the corrections of rivals or by the rivals questioning each other in turn, must be held in high esteem and used whenever time permits, so that honorable rivalry, which is a great incentive to studies may be fostered (*Ratio* XV, 27).

Teachers also used other incentives to encourage learning. Incentives such as the awarding of prizes, titles, badges and so on were very common.

III. *Teacher Preparation*

One of the most valuable aspects of the Jesuit system of education was the care given to the preparation of teachers. The Jesuit Order must be credited with introducing the practice of teacher training. The full course of a Jesuit teacher lasted for 15 to 17 years. At each stage he was required to be able to teach one stage beyond that in which he was actually engaged.

The candidate for admission to the Society was usually accepted for training upon completion of the lower college. He then spent two years as a novice undergoing moral and spiritual discipline, in order to acquire the ability to control himself. After having succeeded at this level, the candidate was sent back to school for one to three years to review the subjects he would teach. During this time he observed and developed understanding of the methods employed by the master teachers. This period, known as the *juniorate* was followed by three years of study in the fields of philosophy, mathematics, and natural science at a university of the Jesuit Order. The candidate then was ready to begin teaching in the lower college under the supervision of a trained teacher who corrected and encouraged him. This period of teaching under supervision lasted three or four years. After this, the candidate entered the *house of studies* in his province to devote four years to the study of Theology and the practice of spiritual exercises. Only after successfully completing this final stage was he ready for ordination and complete control of a class.

Loyola and the Jesuits have made significant contributions to a number of areas in education. They can be said to be the forerunners of the modern educational organization. The main characteristics of the contemporary bureaucratic system of educational organization were already developed by the Jesuits of the seventeenth century. The method of teaching that the Jesuits developed were perhaps very rigid and uniform. One of the criticisms often raised is that the Jesuit system did not allow the teacher to choose materials or method for instruction and everything was planned with regard to how and what to teach. In education today, it is often pointed out that children have various needs and that they respond differently to different methods of instruction. Thus it is said that teachers need to be free to choose from a wide variety

of teaching theories and methods available to them. Such a concern is quite understandable. Part of the blame lies probably with the Society's disregard for primary and elementary education. The educational work of the Jesuits has been almost exclusively on the secondary and higher levels. Consequently, the methods they developed were not suitable for learners at the primary or elementary levels. Nonetheless, the Jesuits' concern with using a ready and proven method for instruction is a valid one. For without it, "much labor can be spent in gathering but little fruit."

It is interesting to note that the Jesuits recognized individual differences of learners. Those with exceptional talents were able to move on quickly and at the same time they provided for the additional time that the slow learners needed to achieve mastery in learning. In the early 70s, Illinois State University used a similar system, for instance, the Professional Education Sequence in its teacher education. Under this system "some students completed the eight-credit package in nine weeks, while others took several years" (Williams, 1984). Some of Bloom's (1982) proposals to allow for additional time that some learners might need, also reflects a similar concern to bring about thoroughness in learning by recognizing individual differences that the Jesuits advocated.

Perhaps one of the most valuable aspects of the Jesuit system of education was the care given to the preparation of teachers. Their system emphasized supervision and direction at every stage in teacher preparation, especially in the beginning. The idea of a student teacher working under a "master teacher" who would help him learn the ropes of classroom management is very significant. The Jesuits believed — and rightly so — that this would circumvent any bad habits that a teacher could develop initially in dealing with the students. Nipping bad habits in the bud, as the Society's insight of human nature shows, would have several advantages. One advantage would be in retaining a good reputation with the students and learning after-the-fact that some teaching method was unfit and had to be changed, could cause students to feel less sure of their teacher and could even loose respect for him in the long run. Also, some bad habits which many young teachers could have acquired may be damaging to the students, thus hindering their performance in the school setting. The society also saw how difficult it would be to "teach an old dog new tricks."

If their methods were uniform and their curriculum fixed, they made up for both in their love and individual concern for each pupil. According to Loyola, the only reward of true teachers is the "respect and affection of their pupils." And probably no class of teachers has ever prompted such affection in their pupils as the Jesuits have.

The educational scheme that Loyola and the Jesuits developed is insightful in many respects, particularly in the context of current discus-

sions about the quality of education and that of teacher preparation.

Thought Questions

1. Loyola and the Jesuits were inspired by religious zeal and fervor in their educational undertakings. Is there something to be said about an almost religious-like commitment and dedication in the contemporary context?

2. The *Ratio Studiorum* was prepared with such care that it took 15 years before a final draft was made. How does this compare with some of our current reform proposals?

3. The Jesuit teaching method used constant review. Does this have any implications for current educational practice?

4. In their teacher preparation, the Jesuits required the prospective teachers to observe master teachers for 1-3 years and to teach under supervision for 3 or 4 years. How might existing school practices be modified to accommodate such a model?

Bibliography

Bacon, Francis. *Advancement of Learning* (1605). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974.

Bloom, B. S. *All Our Children Learning*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1981.

Ganss, G. E. *The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus* (1554). St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources 1970.

Fitzpatrick, E. A. (Ed.). *St. Ignatius and the Ratio Studiorum*, translation by Ball, A. R. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1933.

Williams, D. "Why Teachers Fail." *Newsweek*, September 24, 1984.

Rusk, R. R. *The Doctrines of the Great Educators*. London: Macmillan, 1982.

Part V
HISTORICAL DEJA VU

THE RHETORIC AND REALITY OF ACADEMIC STANDARDS AT CORNELL UNIVERSITY, 1868 TO 1890

Ellen M. Brier
University of Illinois at Chicago

In the Beginning

Cornell University had its beginning in the 1864 legislative session of the New York State Senate, where Ezra Cornell, the senator from Ithaca met Andrew Dickson White, the senator from Syracuse. Cornell headed the Agriculture Committee, and White chaired the Education Committee. In the course of Mr. Cornell's efforts to secure the Morrill Land-Grant funds to establish an agricultural college in Ovid, Mr. White recognized the possibility of realizing his own dream of founding a "great university." Cornell's proposal called for the funds being divided. White, however, did not want the money split. Instead, White believed the funds should remain in tact so that a single great institution of higher learning could be founded. Through personal and political negotiations, Senators Cornell and White joined forces and proposed a bill to charter Cornell University. Although efforts to block the passage of the bill were plentiful, on April 27, 1865, Governor Fenton signed into laws the legislation chartering the Cornell University. Thence, Cornell, the wealthy builder and White, the visionary educator and Cornell University's first president, began to create the new university.

The opening of Cornell was eventful and exciting. Hopeful Cornell applicants converged on the university at the end of September in 1868. Their number far exceeded the university's expectations. In fact, Cornell's first class was the largest ever admitted to any American institution of higher education up to that time. Four hundred and twelve students met the requirements, and sixty applicants were rejected. Those who were not admitted failed to meet the requrements stated in the first university *Register*. Applicants needed to "pass a thoroughly satisfactory examination" in Geography, English Grammar, including Orthography and Syntax, Arithmetic and Algebra to Quadratic Equations. Additional examinations were required of some applicants depending on their proposed course of study. In addition to passing the examinations, candidates for admission also were "required to be at least fifteen years of age, to be of good character, and to be possessed of such physical health and strength as will enable them to pursue the studies of the course which they propose to enter."[1]

At young Cornell a strong tension existed between the rhetoric of academic excellence the universityespoused and the reality of academic

excellence it experienced. Founder Ezra Cornell's motto that he "would found an institution where any person can find instruction in any study"[2] belied the stress on quality. Mr. Cornell's egalitarian philosophy was a source of tension and even conflict with President Andrew Dickson White's desire to build a "great university." Although White's plan was more persistent, in the university's formative stage of development from 1868 to 1890 the "any person" "any study" orientation created its share of problems by promoting an image of the university as capable of being all things to all people.

At the same time the university was attempting to expand access to higher education to the sons and daughters of farmers and mechanics, it also was trying to be academically selective in its admissions. Having rejected almost thirteen percent of its first applicants, Cornell, indeed, exercised a degree of academic selectivity uncommon in late nineteenth century American colleges and universities. From its inception, Cornell University was unique. As neither a purely private nor a solely public university, Cornell had elements of both a private and a public institution. Given this unique status, a question arises as to what institutions might Cornell be compared fairly. If compared to some of the eastern men's colleges, Cornell's admission standards would be less rigorous. However, if compared to the emerging state colleges, Cornell's admission requirements would be more demanding. In addition, Cornell did apply different admission standards to applicants for different courses of study. For example, individuals applying to the Course in Arts had additional requirements in mathematics as well as in Latin and Greek. Thus, the requirements for the Course of Arts equalled or exceeded those in most institutions of higher education of the post civil war era.

For Cornell University, the years between 1868 and 1890 were marked by a search for identity. Although in 1868 when Cornell opened its doors it had a well developed plan of organization in place, it was nonetheless an unfinished institution, a university in a quest for definition. In its infancy, Cornell was faced with the task of clearly defining itself for itself and for the public. The question before Cornell was to what extent it must provide any student, any study. Ezra Cornell's desire to found an institution of higher learning which would be all things to all people generated a considerable amount of institutional tension in the early days. According to Laurence Veysey, the central question which Cornell University faced in its first years "was how far in fact it would bend toward the 'low' or grass-roots version of practical mindedness,"[3] implicit in Mr. Cornell's motto to found an institution where any person could find instruction in any study. The challenge of melding the liberal and the practical, the theoretical and the applied, and the scholarly and the functional steadily persisted in putting itself before Cornell's faculty and administration throughout the university's early history. In meeting this challenge, Cornell developed a working definition for itself and its public which came about by means of "a steady evolution in the general

conception of the university"[4] as outlined in President White's inaugural address.[5] The university, in fact, publicly gave expression to its early definition as it evolved in a work entitled *The Cornell University. What It Is and What It Is Not*, which was published by Cornell in 1872.

Early Policy and Practices

During its early years, Cornell had to develop a working definition of itself in the context of its programs and students. Although selective in its admission practices, the university had its share of academically underprepared students. Unlike many late nineteenth century colleges which had preparatory departments, from its inception Cornell University officially had no preparatory opportunities for the less proficient students. In fact, the university *Register* of 1868 explicitly stated Cornell's position on its role in relation to the underprepared student. Under the heading of "The University System," the *Register* attempted to clarify the nature of a Cornell education and to dispel misconceptions of what it was. First, the *Register* declared, "The University is not a school for instruction in preliminary English branches." The proper institutions for such elementary instruction was the common school or the academy, not Cornell University. Second, the *Register* admonished that "Too much care cannot be given to fundamental preparation." In order to pass the university's entrance examinations, all applicants needed to be well versed in the elementary English branches. An unprepared applicant stood a reasonable chance of being rejected by Cornell. Third, the *Register* asserted, "The University maintains no preparatory department." However, the university did admit applicants with slight academic deficiencies. Further, it conditioned these students and required that the conditions be met within a specified period of time. Students were to get tutoring from preparatory schools in Ithaca, tutors they hired, on their own, or from advanced Cornell students. Fourth, the *Register* stated, "The University is not a reform establishment." Cornell was not intended to change characters, but rather to stimulate minds, to educate. Finally, the *Register* proclaimed that "The University is open to students of any State or Country." This was Cornell's statement of equal opportunity.[6] This five-point statement was incorporated in various forms into *The Cornell Register* for many years to come.

The university held firm in its position on the role of the university in relation to unqualified students. This is not to say that Cornell had no underprepared students in its early years. However, it is to say that in presenting its scholastic image to the public, Cornell emphasized its academic standards rather than the educational opportunities it offered academically deficient students. For example, in *Cornell University. What It Is and What It Is Not*, Cornell stressed its high "standard of scholarship" by comparing itself positively to institutions such as Harvard, Yale, and the University of Michigan. In insisting that Cornell had no need to lower admission standards, the university said, "Whatever is

set down or required at the Cornell examinations is really required." Accordingly, Cornell experienced "No such necessity for increasing the number of students as to make it advisable to slur over the entrance and term examinations."[7] In fact, Cornell's records show that the university did admit students who did not fully meet requirements. From its opening, this practice was not uncommon. Indeed, the academic realities at Cornell differed from the rhetoric the university used in describing itself to the public.

At the begining of academic year 1869-1870, one of the first actions of the Cornell faculty was to establish a systematic method for dealing with applicants who were considered to be academically marginal. The "Faculty Minutes" for September 15, 1869, indicated the establishment of a faculty committee, referred to as the "Committee on Doubtful Cases." This presidentially-appointed committee had five members including: the Registrar, Professors Russel, Evans, Sprague, and Morris. The purpose of the Committee on Doubtful Cases was to review and to "decide upon doubtful cases of application for admission."[8] The creation of this committee was in response to the experience of Cornell's first year when the whole faculty dealt with each questionable admissions case individually. By delegating the task of reviewing these cases to a committee, the faculty was freed from what had proven to be a time-consuming assignment the previous year.

The creation of the Committee on Doubtful Cases did not put an end to the faculty's involvement in evaluating students' petitions. The Cornell faculty frequently reviewed students' requests for exceptions to academic policy. In fact, the "Faculty Minutes" between 1868 and 1890 are filled with numerous examples of this practice. For example, on September 29, 1869, the faculty considered and subsequently accepted the request of a student rejected in the classical course to be admitted as a special student in literature.[9] This type of request was particularly common. Students rejected in one course of study often petitioned the faculty to be admitted as special students or as optional students in other areas of study.

Rejection was a fact of life at Cornell from its first day. It generated concern among those applicants who were identified as the chosen and disappointment among those who failed to meet Cornell's requirements. For many of those students who were rejected, however, the Cornell faculty approved their acceptance into other courses of study. The Registers do not discuss this reconsideration option. Its existence did not receive official notice in the university's public rhetoric, although the "Faculty Minutes" reveal that the option was exercised with a high degree of regularity, thus implying widespread knowledge of the possibility of a second chance of acceptance into the university.

Another type of petition commonly brought before the Cornell faculty

was the request to modify degree requirements in order to allow a student to graduate. These cases usually involved academic deficiencies on the part of the students. Each of these cases was given individual consideration by the entire faculty. Although it could be said that Cornell never relaxed its degree requirements in its early years, it also could be said that the university did make individual exceptions to the standard policy. For example, the Cornell faculty carefully reviewed the case of Mr. D. on 24 June 1870. After evaluating the particulars of Mr. D.'s case, the faculty resolved that "Mr. D.'s deficiency in Greek shall not be an obstacle to his receiving the degree of A.B."[10] Thus, the faculty did not alter the degree requirements in general but rather adjusted them in an individual instance.

During the period between 1868 and 1890, admission requirements were raised regularly. President White discussed the impact of the continuously increasing admission requirements of the early years in his *Report* to the trustees in 1871. White observed that in spite of the fact that Cornell University "constantly raised" the standard of the entrance examination, enrollment increased and the academic achievement of the students improved. Mr. White attributed the increase and improvement to several factors. First, White noted that the "examination papers provided in the University Register show that we exact close study."[11] Unlike many of its contemporaries, Cornell printed sample entrance examination in its *Register*. This practice provided applicants with a practical guide for preparation. As a second reason, White pointed out that Cornell students as a rule had "little money to waste." They had to work hard and had little time for play. Next, the president identified the fact that Cornell students were "generally from the country." Their interests and lifestyles were simple unlike those of many individuals from big cities. White also suggested that the increase in the age requirement worked to Cornell's benefit. From White's perspective, another factor which helped Cornell in its first years were the numerous attacks on the university, because these attacks eliminated many of "the weakly" from applying to Cornell. Finally, White proposed that Cornell's manner of treating students as adults rather than boys had positive results for the university as well as the students. It encouraged better behavior on the part of students and attracted a more mature, more responsible, self-directed student.[12]

Student Views

From an opposite point of view, an editorial in the student newspaper, *The Cornell Era*, stated "As a general rule students lack application." The editorial continued by elaborating on the many negative habits students at Cornell developed in the place of academic application. Among these habits were "walking the streets, accosting friends with agreeable twaddle and jocosely talking about election results." When

examinations come, however, these individuals find "they cannot walk through them." Sometimes, as a result of lack of academic application, students find themselves on condition the next term.[13]

Another edition of *The Cornell Era* addressed the issue of admission standards and unqualified students. In an editorial, the practice of admitting academically deficient students to the University of Michigan was criticized and questioned. Cornell students favored adherence to strict admission standards. The editorial strongly stated Cornell's position:

> But when the only possible benefit — and though we did not see it at first sight, we will allow it — is the collection of tuition fees from soft headed or indifferent applicants for a collegiate education, we must say that in our opinion the end is, though not unworthy, at least insignificant compared with the means, and regret that the step has been taken.[14]

During the early years, *The Cornell Era* frequently addressed the issues of admission standards as well as academic standards. In these editorials and articles, the student writers always took the side of high standards and used the rhetoric of academic excellence.

The university's first years provided a great deal of evidence that the general perception inside Cornell was that the university standards were getting tougher and its students were getting better. However, these years were also marked by some indications to the contrary. For example, in January of 1871, *The Cornell Era* reported that forty-six freshmen were conditioned in Physiology. Of those students, "thirty-seven form a special class to receive extra lectures."[15] This practice of providing extra instruction as a remedy for academic deficiency was not uncommon at Cornell. Similarly, on September 15, 1869, the faculty voted to establish a subsection of Algebra for candidates who had "passed satisfactorily in their other studies" but who fell short in Algebra.[16]

The university did not ignore the deficiencies of its students. At the same time, Cornell did not want to project an image of academic weakness. In fact, President White expressed concern for Cornell's educational image given the caliber of some of its students.[17] Within the institutional context, discussions of students' academic deficiencies enjoyed regular attention. While to its external environment, the university spoke of its high academic standards.

Developing Policies, Practices, and Views

As the university matured, a change in the manner the Cornell faculty handled questions of academic exception occurred. Initially cases of students requesting modifications or exception to academic policy and practice were considered individually by the faculty. By 1872, these cases, rather than being presented to the entire faculty, were referred to

appropriate faculty members for review. In addition to this change, by 1875 a new trend had begun. The faculty started dealing with students more in groups. For example, the June 16, 1875, "Faculty Minutes" indicated the "Committee on the Matter of Conditioned Students" put restrictions, conditions of passing examinations not on individuals, but on classes of indiviuals.[18] These changes reflected the growing complexity of academic administration and the development of effective mechanisms for administering academic policy. As the committees' names suggest, academic excellence was not the only reality the university experienced. In the early stages of its development, the university had to deal with "doubtful cases" and "conditioned students."

While the university internally was trying to resolve issues of "doubtful cases" and "conditioned students," externally its standards of scholarship were being questioned. The reason for this was coeducation. In the public arena, the university defended itself from numerous attacks on its commitment to coeducation. The introduction of women into the university stimulated speculation of the lowering of standards. In response to this negative criticism, The *Era* presented many editorials and articles about the effects of the admission of women. According to the *Era*, the perception that the admission of women meant "the lowering of standards" was a delusion. Further, the *Era* stated that the belief that coeducation results in decreased standards of admission and scholarship, in fact, was contrary to the evidence. In those institutions of secondary and higher education where coeducation existed, standards did not plummet. Indeed, standards were not decreased.[19] Cornell admitted women "on the same conditions as young men, except that they must be at least eighteen years of age."[20] Thus, the minimum age for admission was higher for women than for men. On that basis, all other admission criteria being equal, it could be said that admission standards were higher for women at Cornell. The academic caliber of Cornell's early women quickly put an end to the criticism of coeducation which suggested that the admission of women meant a lowering of standards. In the coeducation case, the rhetoric and the reality of academic excellence were congruent. High academic standards were practiced as well as preached.

Throughout its early years, Cornell's continuous raising of admission standards provided regular opportunities for the university to deal with questions of academic excellence. Reflecting on the raising of the admission standards, The *Era* of 28 September 1877 reported that no one could doubt the benefit of the increased requirements. "As a result, candidates for admission are better prepared and more capable of carrying on the work assigned them."[21] The 1 February 1877 *Era* cautioned against the raising of admission standards if it simply meant "the necessity on the part of the student grinding out a greater number of text books before he comes to college, and does not indicate a change in the character of the work in college." The *Era* continued that this clearly was not the case at

Cornell where the standards were being raised constantly. In consequence of this elevation, "the courses have been somewhat changed, so that the purpose seems to be to raise the college course to a higher level, and to make the certificate of graduation of greater value.[22] On the same point, Acting President Russel reported to the board that "never however have we had such good scholarship in the mass."[23]

In contrast, President White in his annual *Report* in 1882 analyzed the causes for the larger enrollments of students in Cornell's early years. White posited the reasons for such large enrollments. First among them was "the low standard of requirements for admission then enforced." In addition, Cornell's "not knowing what . . . [its] work was to be" contributed to requirements being "very low." These factors "attracted large numbers who might better have been receiving instruction in high schools and academies."[24]

From the perspective of the *Era*, although increased standards at Cornell were supported and promoted, it was advised that the elevation of entrance requirements should be made within a reasonable limit. Requirements should be developed within the limits of the preparatory opportunities available to applicants. These limits should be maintained "at least until there are better schools to bridge over the gap between them and a great share of the common schools of the present time." The *Era* reporter concluded by stating that increases in requirements should bear a direct relation to the instruction offered in the university, "for the true purpose of entrance examinations is not to exclude, but to measure the proficiency of applicants."[25] In fact, improved instruction in the university is what occurred. Increased admission requirements gave "the student more time for instruction in the University and the result is that fewer enter, a larger percentage graduate."[26]

Although retention rates were said to increase as standards of admission were raised, students who fell short of Cornell's high academic expectations persisted through and beyond 1890. Evidence of this is abundant in the departmental reports appended to the *Presidents' Reports*. In 1886, Rhetoric Professor Charles Chauncy Shackford reported that because of the quality of work done in the preparatory schools, "many students are admitted who can hardly write a simple sentence without committing some offence against the rules of good usage." Shackford recommended that preparatory schools should enforce "more rigid and elementary instruction." This in turn would produce "students better fitted to begin the work in composition and Rhetoric in the University."[27] A similar perspective was shared by Professor Jacob Gould Schurman of Philosophy and Ethics. According to Schurman, "though some students did excellent work, all were hampered by a lack of preparation and a few were obliged to give up the course all together."[28] Similarly, Professor Williams in the report on Geology and Paleontology noted that students lacked any preparation in

geology, thus necessitating the most elementary instruction:

> I find that almost all the students entering this class have never taken systematic study in Geology, it is therefore essentially an elementary class.

Williams also indicated that the students represented an academically diverse group which posed instructional challenges for the faculty. According to Professor Williams' assessment of students, there were "great" differences "in the capacity of students to grasp the subject."[29]

In addition to the faculty observations of persistent academic deficiencies among the Cornell student body, there were also many examples of positive observations of the students' academic proficiency. Professors Hewett and White of the German department noted that "the work offered is of a higher order each year." Of course, they attributed the elevated work to better prepared students, and thus improved secondary instruction.[30] Dean Fuertes of Civil Engineering made a similar observation in stating that "the standard of scholarship maintained in this department has been very satisfactory."[31] Professor Thurston, Director of Sibley College of Mechanical Engineering and the Mechanical Arts, optimistically proposed the future possibility of elevating the Mechanical Arts curriculum "by throwing out some of the elementary work in mathematics and perhaps in science" because of advances in instruction in these areas at the secondary school level.[32]

From Infancy to Childhood

Between 1868 and 1890, Cornell University moved from its infancy into its childhood. From its inception, Cornell used the rhetoric of academic standards and excellence when addressing the public, as in the case of the university registers. However, within the university, the rhetoric and the reality it reflected often indicated a quest for standards and excellence which was in progress but not yet realized. The academically unqualified student was well represented at Cornell in its early years. Further, he faculty and administration as well as the student body gave attention to these unqualified students and the related issues of academic quality and standards their presence represented.

Indeed, Cornell's commitment to both egalitarian access and academic selectivity produced a curious tension for and in the university. An examination of what Cornell said and did about academic standards between 1868 and 1890 provides some valuable insights into Cornell university as a developing institution. From this examination, it is clear that while attempting to define itself as an institution of higher learning, Cornell also was attempting to create a public image of academic excellence. A review and an analysis of the university's public documents, the Registers, the *Era*, and *Cornell University. What It Is and What It Is Not*

reveal an image of Cornell as an institution totally committed to its standards. According to these publications, the university steadfastly adhered to its high academic standards and refused to entertain the option of academic compromise. However, a different image of Cornell emerges from an examination of the university's internal documents, the President's Reports and the Faculty Minutes. These documents clearly and unequivocally indicate that Cornell modified its standards on a case by case basis.

By dealing with individual exceptions to the standards, the university managed to maintain its standards in the public's view. The fact that Cornell did not have a preparatory department and emphatically stated this in the Registers served to promote the university as being on a higher level than the average institution of higher learning of the period. A close examination of the internal documents provides evidence of many preparatory efforts within and targentially related to the university. The university actually spawned a preparatory school, the Cascadilla School which was founded by Cornell Professors McKoon and Wait to prepare students for the University. In addition, the university record establishes that special class sections were offered to remedy the academic deficiencies of the university's early students.

Cornell's public record and its private record present different pictures of the university. To read one record without reading the other would result in a distorted image. Between 1868 and 1890, the public Cornell and the private Cornell had a tense, sometimes contradictory, but always curious relationship. In order to understand this dynamic interaction, both the public rhetoric and the private reality must be scrutinized and thus, the institutional history revised.

Notes

[1] *The Cornell Register*, 1868-1869, p. 42.

[2] *The Cornell Register*, 1869-1870, p. 17.

[3] Laurence R. Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965), p. 82.

[4] Andrew Dickson White, *Autobiography of Andrew Dickson White* (New York: The Century Co., 1907), p. 387.

[5] *The Cornell Register*, 1869-1870, pp. 19-32.

[6] *The Cornell Register*, 1868-1869, pp. 30-31.

[7] *Cornell University. What It Is and What It Is Not* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1872), pp. 19-20.

[8] Cornell University, "Faculty Minutes," 1869.

[9] *Ibid.*

[10] Cornell University, "Faculty Minutes," 1870.

[11] Cornell University, *President's Report*, 1871.

[12] *Ibid.*

[13] *The Cornell Era*, 2 December 1870, p. 93.

[14] *The Cornell Era*, 26 May 1871, p. 236.

[15] *The Cornell Era*, 20 January 1871, p. 116.

[16] Cornell University, "Faculty Minutes," 1869.

[17] Cornell University, *President's Report*, 1869.

[18] Cornell University, "Faculty Minutes," 1875.

[19] *The Cornell Era*, 13 September 1872, p. 4.

[20] *The Cornell Register*, 1872-1873, p. 6.

[21] *The Cornell Era*, 28 September 1877, p. 1.

[22] *The Cornell Era*, 1 February 1877, p. 2.

[23] Cornell University, *President's Report*, 1879.

[24] Cornell University, *President's Report*, 1882.

[25] *The Cornell Era*, 1 February 1877, p. 3.

[26] Cornell University, *President's Report*, 1881.

[27] Cornell University, *President's Report*, 1886.

[28] Cornell University, *President's Report*, 1887.

[29] *Ibid.*

[30] Cornell University, *President's Report*, 1886.

[31] *Ibid.*

[32] Cornell University, *President's Report*, 1887.

TOWARD THE REHABILITATION OF WILLIAM CHANDLER BAGLEY: SOME NOTES ON HIS VIEWS ON RACE AND GENDER

Erwin V. Johanningmeier
University of South Florida

Nearly twenty years ago when I first looked at William Chandler Bagley, his work and that for which he stood,[1] I concluded that the "essentialist" label that had been attached to him told only a part of the Bagley story. It directed attention away from the major part of his career and work. Now, I would say that Bagley has always been unfairly characterized in our histories of education and that that unfair — incomplete and partial — depiction continues. Accounts of him and that for which he stood have been unfair because they have focused almost exclusively on his participation in the construction of the essentialist platform which was expressed in 1938 and the subsequent attention he received in the national media for publically objecting to what he believed were the errors and excesses in what was then called progressive education. Bagley continues to be cast as the enemy of the progressives. Recently, Diane Ravitch, in a work about the extension of educational opportunity in the post World War II era, has accepted the standard characterization, perhaps one should say caricature, of Bagley. In her first reference to him, she describes him as "a steadfast critic of progressive extremism."[2] Her next reference to him establishes his relationship with I.L. Kandel. Those two, she writes, "were articulate critics of the pretensions and tendencies of progressive education."[3] Her third reference to Bagley describes him as "Kilpatrick's leading adversary." In that reference, Ravitch does, it should be pointed out, acknowledge that Bagley "complained in 1934 that substituting 'activities' for 'systematic and sequential learning would defeat the most important ends of education in a democracy," in particular, the goal of insuring 'as high a level of common culture as possible'."[4] That is not an inaccurate statement about Bagley's views. However, it does not emphasize or even state that Bagley was consistently concerned that all be allowed to and prepared to participate in "a high level of common culture."

There are two reasons why rehabilitation of Bagley is an appropriate endeavor. First, it is an exercise in assembling a full and accurate history, an exercise in showing that many of our facile characterizations oversimplify and hide important complexities and relationships. Second, to rehabilitate Bagley is to once again document that there is no necessary relationship between one's social-political views and one's educational-pedagogical views. Frequently, those schoolboard members who are

most politically conservative are more willing to support departures from traditional educational practice than are their colleagues who hold to liberal social views. One can be thoroughly liberal in both social and pedagogical matters. One can be conservative in each or liberal in one but not the other. Bagley is an example of one who consistently held to traditional or conservative views on educational-pedagogical matters but who was socially liberal. By saying that he was liberal on social matters, we are saying that he was consistently on the side of extending educational opportunities and maintaining access to educational opportunities while he was opposed to practices, policies or educational structures which appeared to have the potential for limiting educational access and opportunity. In maintaining such a position, he showed an awareness that not all had equal access to educational opportunities and was clearly on the side of insuring that all would have equal access. Moreover, there is evidence that such concerns extended beyond concerns about the opportunities afforded white males.

The typical portrayal of Bagley as a "steadfast critic of progressive extremism" has drawn attention away from the totality of his career, the significance of his role and views, and his contributions to public education. His is a career which began not in the 1930s or 1940s but at the beginning of the century. In 1900, he completed his doctoral dissertation in psychology at Cornell University and became the eighth of Edward Bradford Titchener's fifty-four successful doctoral students. In 1917, Bagley resigned his position as Director of the University of Illinois' School of Education to accept a position at Teachers College, Columbia University. Examination of his early career can tell us something about the development of education as a discipline, or field of study, and the role of psychology in that development. As I.L. Kandel reported, "when Bagley began his career in education, "he believed that the art of teaching could be eventually based on a sound body of laws and principles resulting from research and experimentation." Bagley was one of the first of his generation "to attempt to build up a science of education on the basis of psychology, neurology, and biology."[5] To know the complete Bagley story is to know that while his colleagues were building "the one best system," he was attending to that system's needs for trained teachers. To know the complete Bagley story is to know that when he began to criticize how intelligence tests were being used in the 1920s, that criticism was coming from one trained in one of the outstanding psychological laboratories in the country.

In trying to rehabilitate Bagley, there may be some utility in asking whether progressive-minded historians, ignorant of the fact that there are no necessary logical relationships between one's philosophical beliefs about the nature of reality, humankind, and the good society on the one hand and one's beliefs about good education and good educational practice on the other, did not wrap him in the essentialist blanket because

he consistently argued against departures from systematic instruction and traditional school subjects. A more specific and more plausible explanation is that Bagley has been victim of his friend, admirer and biographer I.L. Kandel. Kandel depicted Bagley as the "Stalwart Educator" who was correct and right to battle against fads and progressives. Yet, it is possible to overstate his differences with those whom we consider liberal or progressive — certainly those we do not usually think of as conservative or as essentialists. While the record does support the claim that Bagley's views differed from those of the progressives, it does not support the claim that he was their enemy.

Harold O. Rugg, Bagley's first doctoral student, certainly no "essentialist," added a long note about Bagley in his discussion of the Essentialists in his 1947 text, *Foundations for American Education*. About Bagley, Rugg wrote:

> I was with him almost continuously for thirty-five years . . . was his first Ph.D. in the University of Illinois . . . saw him deliberately choose for himself the role of brake on what he always thought was the too rapidly turning wheel of educational innovation . . . saw him question critically the junior high school reorganization of the grades, the intelligence tests in the 1910's, the hereditarians in the nature *vs.* nurture controversy in the 1920's . . . and for two decades the programs of the progressive schools. We came together again when I joined the Teachers College Faculty in 1920. My hat is off to a loyal friend, an untiring fighter for what he believed in, a stanch defender of the community of culture, one who practiced democracy as he preached it, and — a rarity in American education during his lifetime — a master of the English paragraph.[6]

Bagley had other non-essentialist relationships. His relationship with Boyd H. Bode, his classmate at Cornell, is one which shows that while there was not complete agreement between the two, there was a high degree of respect for each other's work. While Bagley was a member of the Department of Education at the University of Illinois and Bode was a member of the University's Philosophy Department they jointly taught seminars on educational values and the philosophical bases of educational theories.[7] Their ability to work together endured. Bode's *Modern Educational Theories* (1927) was part of Macmillan's series on education for which Bagley was the editor. Bagley wrote the editor's introduction for that book which included several references to his own work.[8] Two years later, Bode published *Conflicting Psychologies of Learning* in which there are several references to Bagley's work.[9] Two years after that (1931), Bagley published *Education, Crime, and Social Progress* in which he made effective use of the work Bode's student Pedro Orata had completed on mental discipline and transfer of training.[10] The final point to be made in the case for "non-guilt" by association is that in 1918 Bagley and Charles A. Beard began collaborating on the preparation of school history texts.[11]

Evidence of Bagley's liberalism is not difficult to document. An important and vivid instance is the Bagley-Snedden debate over the relationship between liberal and vocational education at the 1914 NEA convention. Snedden then argued that the education needed for "producers" was different from that needed by those destined to be "consumers." Producers need not liberal education but vocational education. The aims of liberal education were too imprecise for preparing efficient producers. Those aims were usually expressed in "vague and mystical phrases": "culture," "character," "mental discipline," "self-reliance," "capacity for self-directions," and "social efficiency." However, according to Snedden, the aim of vocational education — "to equip a young person for a recognized calling" — was quite precise. Since it was so precise, "it should," Snedden believed, "surely be possible for us by studying the requirements of recognized callings, such as medicine, teaching, bookkeeping, carpentering, printing, tailoring, cooking, and the like, to derive from each one and to define those specific requirements as to skill, technical knowledge and the ideals which persons trained for that vocation should possess. To insure efficiency in the educational system, at age fourteen, children were to be designated as future producers or future consumers and sent along the appropriate educational course.[12]

Bagley objected to dividing children so some children could be trained to consume while others had to produce. He insisted that separate schools for vocational education would only perpetuate existing social stratification and held that "the questioning-begging statement that such stratification already exists" was no defense for continuing it. Establishment of a "permanent proletariat" was too expensive, for it was a system that failed to use talent which was evenly distributed among the social classes. In place of early differentiation of students, Bagley urged postponement of differentiation for as long as possible. It was, he admitted, also costly to keep the door of opportunity open at every level of the educational ladder," but that cost was necessary for the preservation of a democratic society.[13]

In the years prior to World War I, when many were urging that the United States model their schools after those of Germany, Bagley objected that European models were inappropriate for the United States. Imitation of European educational arrangements and practices did not suit American purposes and values. For example, in 1914 he explained the differences between the German and the American societies and school systems to a meeting of Indiana teachers by likening the school systems to elevators. The Germans had many elevators which took students to specific rooms — occupations and social stations — from which they could not escape. The Americans had but one elevator. It took all students as far as they wanted to go or as far as they were able to go. He warned that there was a movement to replace the one elevator with many

and that the price of the proposed change was too high, for it would separate students. He told the teachers that if the students were brought together in school they would have "the advantage of that social intercourse and mutual acquaintanceship which leads to mutual sympathy and cooperation in later life."[14]

An earlier indication of Bagley's "liberalism" is to be found in his response to Lotus D. Coffman's *The Social Composition of the Teaching Population* (1911) — the first modern sociological study of the teaching population. Bagley thought Coffman's findings were "unbelievable" but he was forced to believe because there was no way to question the data and the statistics Coffman collected and presented. The "unbelievable" characteristics of teachers Coffman documented were the general immaturity of teachers, their inadequate or total lack of professional training, the brief tenure of teachers as teachers, the poor status and even poorer salaries of teachers, the dreadful condition of normal schools where those who were trained were trained, and the use of teaching as a stepping stone to marriage for women and to administrative places for men. Coffman had demonstrated that the public schools were staffed by teachers who were, in large measure, inexperienced and either untrained or ill-grained for teaching. He further showed that the public schools needed one hundred twenty-five thousand new teachers every year to fill the places of those who quit teaching (the average tenure was estimated to be about four years). The normal schools, training schools and teachers colleges were graduating only about nineteen thousand teachers annually. That rate was not quite enough to fill new vacancies due to the increase of specializations in the teaching fields and the new positions needed to satisfy the requirements of increasing enrollments.

Coffman had demonstrated that the greater proportion of new teachers entering the field each year (excluding the nineteen thousand who were trained) came from families of less than six children each (at that time the average family in the United States had four children); "that the greater proportion of them come from families the average income of which is less than eight hundred dollars a year; and that most of them enter the work of teaching with no intention of making a life career, but merely because it offers an opportunity to obtain a little badly needed money without involving the expenditure of much time in preparing themselves for the work."[15] As blameworthy as the situation and the practice were, Bagley was not prepared to criticize the teachers.

For Bagley there was an obvious remedy to the dreadful situation Coffman had documented. Many had already proposed that certification requirements be raised and that salaries be raised in order to attract better candidates into teaching. Bagley was not opposed to the purposes of such recommendations but was not willing to implement either of them, for to do so would be tantamount to putting "boys and girls" out of work. While Bagley did not want to turn the "boys and girls" out on the streets,

he did not want them in the public school classrooms. They were not qualified to teach. To keep them in the classrooms was an expensive act of charity. "Our sympathy goes out to these young people," he confessed, "but there is no earthy reason why this form of charity (and in effect this is what it is) should be given at the expense of millions of children."[16]

If certification standards and salaries were gradually raised as many had proposed, the sociological base of the profession would gradually shift to those families who could afford to send their children to the training schools. Bagley was not certain he wanted to do that. He asked:

> Should we not leave the profession of teaching open to any youth of the land irrespective of his parents economic status, provided only that he himself shows capacity for the work? Otherwise are we not in effect making class distinctions in the very calling that must be depended upon to keep alive our ideals of democracy and equal opportunity?[17]

While Bagley is still largely characterized as an "essentialist" in our histories of education, his objections to how results from the administration of the World War I Army intelligence tests (Army Alpha and Beta) were used to support assertions of racial superiority are still cited and used by psychologists in their reviews of the nature vs. nurture issue.[18] The work which is typically cited is *Determinism in Education: A Series of Papers on the Relative Influence of Inherited and Acquired Traits in Determining Intelligence, Achievement, and Character* (1925). That book is a collection of papers which began in 1922 when Bagley delivered a paper, "Educational Determinism; or, Democracy and the I.Q.," to the Society of College Teachers of Education.[19] In that paper, Bagley argued that the "prevalent conviction that the influence of education is very narrowly circumscribed by traits or capacities which, for each individual, are both innate and in themselves practically unmodified by experience" which had been given "an emphatic sanction and a very widely extended currency by the development of mental measurements" was "based, not upon the facts that the measurements reveal, but upon the hypotheses and assumptions that the development of the measures has involved."[20] That paper did not go unnoticed. It drew rejoinders from Guy M. Whipple and Lewis M. Terman,[21] and Bagley responded.[22]

What intelligence tests actually measured was an important question for Bagley. Moreover, it was not just a technical psychological question. It was fundamentally a question of educational policy. Just as Bagley was not prepared to accept an educational system which distinguished between producers and consumers, as demonstrated in the Bagley-Snedden debate so Bagley was not prepared to accept assumptions about intelligence which could be used to defend an educational system which distinguished between followers and leaders. He was not unwilling to deny differences among people but he was not willing to go as far as the

"determinists" were. Because the relative importance of nature and nurture were not known, Bagley wanted, unlike the "determinists," to keep the issue open and to maintain faith in the efficacy of education. Bagley clearly believed that education could effect a kind of equality among humankind. He wrote:

> I make no absurd claim that if I teach an average man the principle of gravitation . . . I am making the common man equal to Newton . . . . I do maintain that I have enabled this common man in a very real way to participate in the experiences of one of the most gifted men of all time; I maintain that I have given him one control over his environment substantially equal to that which this gifted man himself possessed; and I maintain that *in respect of this possession* I have made this common man the equal of all others who possess it. There are undoubtedly some men who could never grasp this conception, but I should wish to refine my teaching processes far more than teaching processes have yet been refined before reaching any fatalistic conclusions as to where the line is to be drawn.[23]

The "determinist," Bagley claimed, "proposes to throw overboard the democratic ideal of education; to substitute a deceptive 'equity of opportunity' for a whole-hearted effort to bring the masses of our children up to a reasonable intellectual standard; and to devote educational efforts to the training of leaders the great majority of whom, under an ignorant electorate, would fall to a quick defeat at the hands of the demogogue and the political machine."[24]

In 1923, Bagley turned his attention to Carl C. Brigham's *A Study of American Intelligence* (1923). In it he argued against using the army tests to support "pro-Nordic propaganda." He assumed the position of what he called the "rational equalitarian." He even acknowledged that the "rational equalitarian" could concede to Brigham "the dangers of unrestricted immigration" and "the undesirable quality of much of our recent immigration."[25] What Bagley was willing to concede was limited, however. As Bagley expressed the point,

> But one may believe all this without claiming for the Army tests a validity as accurate indices of native intelligence which they do not possess; and one may certainly believe all this without identifying one's self with that 'parlor' cult of ku-kluxism of which our radical pro-Nordic propagandists constitute the mother-clan. To recognize unrestricted immigration as an evil is one thing; to fan the fires of race-prejudice with alleged scientific findings is quite another.[26]

In arguing against "pro-Nordic propaganda" and Brigham's "theory of Nordic supremacy," Bagley admitted to believing in racial differences. However, rather than emphasize the differences between races he wanted to emphasize the power of education, of schooling. Significantly, he was willing to report that there may be evidence that racial differences did not exist. In his attack of Brigham's work, he wrote that "while no one can seriously doubt the general superiority of the whites

over the negroes in native intelligence, the Army tests show clearly the tremendous influence of good schools in stimulating the growth of intelligence and the corresponding handicap imposed by poor schools."[27] To make his point, he emphasized that the Army Alpha scores could be used to show "that the literate negroes from Illinois not only surpassed the literate negroes from the South but also achieved a median score above the median scores of the literate whites from nine Southern states; that the literate negroes from New York surpassed the literate whites from five Southern states; that the literate negroes from Pennsylvania surpassed the literate whites from two Southern states; while for all Northern negroes reported, the median Alpha score surpasses the median Alpha score for the whites of Mississippi, Kentucky, and Arkansas."[28]

While arguing that schooling did have a positive effect on "intelligence," the "rational equalitarian" did "not deny racial differences in intelligence-levels." The program of the "rational equalitarian," Bagley wrote:

> . . . recognizes a fair degree of probability that the Negro race will never produce so large a proportion of highly gifted persons as will the white races. It recognizes a possibility that certain of the white strains may be more prolific in talent and genius than certain of the others; but it also holds that, in the present state of knowledge, invidious distinctions cannot safely be drawn among Nordics, Alpines, and Mediterraneans in this regards. It holds furthermore that the level of effective intelligence in any group of whatever race can be substantially raised through education.[29]

By contemporary standards, the "rational equalitarian" held to positions now deemed thoroughly unacceptable. While wanting "a vast extension of educational facilities and a far-reaching refinement of educational materials and methods," the "rational equalitarian" did endorse "the establishment of the ideal of race-purity in all major races" and "a voluntary acceptance of eugenic practices to the end that, *in all races*, the reproduction of less worthy stock may be reduced."[30] For Bagley, "coercion," "annihilation" or "subjugation" of any race was unacceptable and certain to be unproductive. While recognizing "racial *differences* for what they are," he wanted to minimize their importance and build a program "upon the far more numerous *resemblences* that now exist, and upon the already demonstrated possibility of multiplying such resemblences." Rather than intensify "biological differentiation," he wanted to "stimulate cultural integration." In language reminiscent of Booker T. Washington's Atlanta Compromise he wrote that "diverse racial stocks can learn to live together and work together without necessitating a blend of blood, and that undesirable blends of blood can be prevented through education."[31]

Significantly, Bagley seems to have gone out of his way to report that racial differences which were believed to exist may, in fact, be difficult to

document. When his attack on Brigham's work was being reprinted in *Determinism and Education*, he included the following footnote:

> As this book goes to press I am informed by Dr. Harold Rugg, who directed the testing-program in the recent Philippine school survey, that the results of the survey raise serious doubts of the existence of racial differences in innate intelligence in so far as the numerous racial elements represented by the Philippine population are concerned.[32]

There is some evidence to indicate that Bagley was interested in the racial question several years before the development of Army Alpha. In 1966, it was suggested to me that George C. Kyte might be able to tell me something about Bagley's early career. I wrote and asked a number of questions which Prof. Kyte tried to answer as best he could. Then, I had no questions about Bagley's views on race. Still, he included the following paragraph in his letter:

> As I was thinking about William Bagley, I recalled another item about him which you will want. While I was working with him, he completed and published a little book entitled, "Determinism in Education." He had been very active in the controversy over the concept of the intelligence quotient, belonging to the group opposing the Lewis Terman concept that the quotient measured intelligence of an individual and therefore was a permanent thing. Doctor Bagley vigorously opposed this concept and was prominent in the N.S.S.E. debates at that time. He wrote the little book to prove his point that the I.Q. was not a permanent label and, he told me, paid H.E. Buchholz of Warwick and York to publish it, in 1925. His reason for assuming the cost of it was that it represented his personal convictions and consequently he should pay for their publications.[33]

Kyte's recollection that Bagley told him that he paid for the cost of publishing the book is plausible. Bagley had known Buchholz since 1910 when Bagley became one of the four co-founders of the *Journal of Educational Psychology* which was published by Warwick and York. However, Bagley's Preface to *Determinism in Education* reveals a contrary claim. In that Preface Bagley wrote:

> Acknowledgment is also due to Mr. H.E. Buchholz, president of the publishing house of Warwick and York, for his generosity in suggesting that the papers be assembled in their present form, and for his courage in assuming the financial burden of their publication. To his own intelligent faith in democracy, Mr. Buchholz has given clear and convincing testimony (witness his book, "Of What Use Are Common People?"). This faith may explain in part his willingness to stand sponsor for the present venture.[34]

Whatever the case may be about who paid for the cost of publishing *Determinism in Education* two important points are clear. First, Bagley believed the subject matter of the book to be very important. Second, as was reported earlier, his interest in the racial question existed before the

1920s. In 1966, I wrote a letter to T.E. Musselman who had been a student of Bagley's at the University of Illinois when the Education Club was founded there in 1909 — the Club which became Kappa Delta Pi in 1911. I did not then ask any questions about Bagley's views on race, but Musselman's letter suggests that Bagley then had an interest in the question. The following is from Musselman's letter:

> . . . I remember being directed to a large basement room in Old Main Hall. We were asked to take notebooks, and enter quietly, to take notes, and in no way to interfere with the progress of instructions being carried on. He requested absolute silence.
>
> In this larger class room was an alert woman teacher with a mixed class of negro and white children from 6 to 8 years of age. She was clever and had a number of play problems which she presented to her young companions. To them it was play, not schooling. Yet we were making an analysis of the speed with which the children accepted suggestions, and the depth of their reactions-black-white-male-female.

Days later we enjoyed another similar experiment, the children being 10 to 12 years of age.

> The reports of our class with their suggestions and recommendations were beautifully analyzed and discussed by Dr. Bagley. He was so keenly appreciative of the superior teaching methods of this woman together with his interest in the reactions of these young students, that his handling and compliments of the entire experiment inspired all of us older students to a more gracious outlook on the possibilities of the teaching profession.[35]

When Musselman visited the University of Illinois campus in April, 1967, I asked him about the "experiments" in Old Main Hall. I was then interested in notions Bagley may have had about a laboratory school. Musselman reported that he knew nothing about that but related that in class Bagley pointed out that none of the students recorded any differences between black and white children.

Musselman also gave me a copy of a letter he had written to J. Richard McElheny, Executive Secretary and Treasurer of Kappa Delta Pi. When Kappa Delta Pi was founded, Bagley had asked Musselman to write the ritual, and Musselman was obviously proud of what he had accomplished. In that letter he wrote:

> Several years later when the national conclave was held in Milwaukee, Dr. Bagley wrote me inviting me to be his guest at the Hotel Schroeder where the meetings were to be held. . . . One thing that impressed me that night was I saw them initiate the first colored teacher ever taken into Kappa Delta Pi.[36]

A brief examination of the founding of Kappa Delta Pi (1911) which grew out of the Education Club which was formed at the University of Illinois in 1909 affords an opportunity to show that Bagley was involved

in the formation of an organization which clearly did not want to exclude people from participation on the basis of gender. In his history of Kappa Delta Pi, Alfred Lawrence Hall-Quest tells us that it was Bagley "who, as director of the School of Education, supported and largely directed the establishing of the Education Club" at Illinois.[37] Musselman wrote the following to McElheny about the founding of the Education Club:

> . . . I remember in 1909 when Dr. Bagley called me into his class room and suggested the formation of an Education Club.
>
> The selection of twenty-eight members was divided, as I remember, equally among the men and women in the top one tenth of the Department of Education, provided they expected to enter the teaching profession.
>
> The matter of creating an honorary educational fraternity was among our early problems and at Dr. Bagley's suggestion, I was instructed to write a similar organization at Indiana University, honorary in nature, but whose membership was limited to men. We suggested the unification of the two organizations but with membership open to both men and women.
>
> As nothing satisfactory could be agreed on, Dr. Bagley suggested we discontinue our efforts to interest the Indiana group, and instead transform the Illinois Educational organization into a permanent honorary educational fraternity. He discussed the matter with Truman Kelly also who was in hearty accord with Dr. Bagley's suggestions.[38]

Rather than join with Pi Kappa Mu at Indiana University to found what eventually became Phi Delta Kappa, the Education Club at the University of Illinois decided to found Kappa Delta Pi and not exclude women from the organization. About that decision Hall-Quest wrote: "At the crisis, when the great decision had to be made in favor of the new national organization for men only and in the interest of a more general professional society, or in favor of a society committed to the principles of coeducation and scholarship, it was he [Bagley] who advocated and championed the establishing of a national Society devoted to these latter principles."[39]

Shortly after the founding of Kappa Delta Pi, Bagley indicated that he supported removal of restrictions on women teachers. Not to allow married women to teach was, he argued, inefficient because it deprived the nation of what it needed — experienced and efficient teachers. In 1913, he observed that there was developing a tendency in certain parts of the nation to allow women to teach after marriage. He supported this development. In customary fashion he acknowledged the possible legitimacy of the opponent's position. He thus admitted that there were "many administrative disadvantages involved in the policy of employing married women as teachers,"[40] but did not specify what those disadvantages were. For him, the advantages were more important than the disadvantages. He wrote that

> We can conceive of no disadvantage that is comparable for a moment with the loss and waste caused by the annual defection of one-fifth of our teaching population; and this loss and waste might be checked in some small measure, at least, by permitting married women to remain in the service.[41]

In 1915, Bagley endorsed President Wilson's suggestion that married women be allowed to teach in the District of Columbia's schools and Ella Flagg Young's recommendation that the rule of the Chicago schools which forbade the employment of a married teacher within two years of childbirth be amended to allow such women employment one year after childbirth. Those developments he described as "gratifying indications that the prejudice against the employment of married women as public school teachers is breaking down."[42]

If one remembers that Bagley's career ended several years before the Brown *decision* and refrains from asking whether he lived by the standards we now accept, we can conclude that Bagley is one of our important predecessors. He may not have taken down all the barriers we now clearly see as objectionable. However, he was clearly on the side of eliminating barriers and increasing the participation of all in public education.

Notes

[1] Erwin V. Johanningmeier, "William Chandler Bagley's Changing Views on the Relationship Between Psychology and Education," *History of Education Quarterly*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (Spring 1969), p. 3.

[2] Diane Ravitch, *The Troubled Crusade: American Education, 1945-1980* (New York: Basic Books, 1983), p. 49.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 55.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 58.

[5] I.L. Kandel, *William Chandler Bagley: Stalwart Educator* (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1961), p. 63.

[6] Harold Rugg, *Foundations for American Education* (Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York: World Book Co., 1947), p. 607.

[7] Henry C. Johnson, Jr. and Erwin V. Johanningmeier, *Teachers for the Prairie: The University of Illinois and the Schools, 1868-1945* (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1972), pp. 200 & 206.

[8] Boyd H. Bode, *Modern Educational Theories* (New York: Vintage Books, n.d.), pp. 19, 41, 72, 139, 208, 219, 314, 317, 320 & 328.

[9] Boyd H. Bode. *Conflicting Psychologies of Learning* (Boston, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1929), pp. 48, 49, 54, 105, 107, 121, 124, 265, 275 & 285.

[10] See: Pedro Tamesis Orata. *The Theory of Identical Elements* (Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1928); William C. Bagley. *Education, Crime, and Social Progress* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1931), p. 126; and William C. Bagley. *Education and Emergent Man* (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1934), p. 87.

[11] See: Charles A. Beard and William C. Bagley. *The History of the American People* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1918).

[12] David Snedden, "Fundamental Distinctions Between Liberal and Vocational Education, I," *NEA Proceedings* (1914), pp. 151-156.

[13] William C. Bagley, "Fundamental Distinctions Between Liberal and Vocational Education, II," *NEA Proceedings* (1914), p. 170.

[14] William C. Bagley, "The Social Achievements of the American Public School," *Proceedings of the Indiana State Teachers' Association* (1914), p. 117.

[15] William C. Bagley, "The Injustice of Low Standards," *School and Home Education*, Vol. XXXI, No. 3 (November 1911), p. 92.

[16] *Ibid.*

[17] William C. Bagley, "The Remedy: Normal School Training at Public Expense," *School and Home Education*, Vol. XXXI, No. 3 (November 1911), p. 93.

[18] For example, see: Lee J. Cronbach, "Five Decades of Public Controversy Over Mental Testing," *American Psychologist*, Vol. 30, No. 1 (January 1975), p. 11.

[19] Bagley's "Educational Determinism; or, Democracy and the I.Q." was first presented at the February, 1922 Chicago meeting of the Society of College Teachers of Education, it subsequently appeared in *Studies in Education: Educational Monographs of the Society of College Teachers of Education*, No. XI (Baltimore: J.H. Furst Co., 1922). In 1925, it appeared as "Democracy and the I.Q.," the first chapter of Bagley's *Determinism in Education: A Series of Papers on the Relative Influence of Inherited and Acquired Traits in Determining Intelligence, Achievement, and Character* (Baltimore: Warwick & York, 1925). All subsequent references are to the version which appeared in *Determinism in Education*.

[20] Bagley, "Democracy and the I.Q.," p. 11.

[21] See: Guy M. Whipple, "Educational Determinism; A Discussion of Professor Bagley's Address at Chicago," *School and Society*, Vol. 15, No. 388 (June 3, 1922) and Lewis M. Terman, "The Psychological Determinist; or Democracy and the I.Q.," *The Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 16, No. 1 (June 1922).

[22] For Bagley's rejoinders to Whipple and Terman see: "Educational Determinism Again: A Rejoinder to Professor Whipple's Reply," *School and Society*, Vol. 16, No. 397 (August 5, 1922) and "Professor Terman's Determinism: A Rejoinder," *The Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 6, No. 5 (December 1922). These rejoinders appeared as Chapter II of *Determinism in Education* — "Further Fallacies of Determinism."

[23] Bagley, "Democracy and the I.Q.," pp. 29-30.

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 28.

[25] William C. Bagley, "The Army Tests and the Pro-Nordic Propaganda" reprinted as Chapter VI of *Determinism in Education*, p. 113.

[26] *Ibid.*, pp. 113-114.

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 125.

[28] *Ibid.*

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 129.

[30] *Ibid.*, p. 130.

[31] *Ibid.*, pp. 130-131.

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 129.

[33] Personal Correspondence: George C. Kyte to Erwin V. Johanningmeier, September 1, 1966.

[34] Bagley, *Determinism in Education*, p. 8.

[35] Personal Correspondence: T.E. Musselman to Erwin V. Johanningmeier, September 23, 1966.

[36] Personal Correspondence: T.E. Musselman to Richard McElheny, 1963 included in Musselman to Johanningmeier, September 23, 1966.

[37] Alfred Lawrence Hall-Quest, *Kappa Delta Pi, 1911-1936* (New York: The Macmillan Co.), p. 44.

[38] Musselman to McElheny, 1963.

[39] Hall-Quest, *Kappa Delta Pi*, p. 44.

[40] William C. Bagley, "Married Women as Public-School Teachers," *School and Home Education*, Vol. XXXIII, No. 4 (December 1913), p. 118.

[41] *Ibid.*

[42] William C. Bagley, "Married Women as Public-School Teachers," *School and Home Education*, Vol. XXXIV, No. 8 (April 1915), p. 281.

UNDERSTANDING HISTORY OF EDUCATION

Robert R. Sherman
University of Florida

I should not travel under false colors, so I will say immediately that my book, *Understanding History of Education* (2d ed.; Schenkman Publishing Co., 1984), is not an interpretative account of the history of education. In fact, it is more a philosophy of history of education than anything else. I sent a copy to a friend in Taiwan, and his reply was that it is a philosophical approach to the study.

When I went to the University of Florida in 1967 I was asked to teach undergraduate history of education courses as well as philosophy of education. The two courses seem to me to be dependent on each other, at least if you approach them as intellectual history, and I like the study of history, so I was glad to do it. I soon realized that other than learning some of the content of history of education — events and relationships, at best; names, dates, and "facts," at worst — students had little realization that historical accounts can differ and change depending on interpretations and evidence at hand and that one can get better at the study of history by developing it as a skill. In short, I wanted to show what is involved in "doing" history, how one can get better at doing it (skill), and how historical interpretations are not cut and dried but can be argued over.

Consequently, during the first weeks of class, as a beginning, I used a lot of readings and xeroxed handouts. When the logistics of bringing these all together became more difficult, I put them together into a book, which was edited with the assistance of Joseph Kirschner of Youngstown State University and was published by Schenkman Publishing Company in Cambridge, Massachusetts, in 1976. The focus of the book is what we called "historiography," the study of how history is done or what is involved in doing it.

The book was not a simple editing of other person's ideas. It was organized into six chapters, each of which began with a substantial introduction to the chapter topic, comments about the skills used in the chapter, a focusing summary of the readings to come, and suggestions for further reading. In the first chapter our claim was (and is) that the history of education itself has a history and that knowing it might give one a better sense of its present status and function. That is followed by a discussion of the role of history of education in teacher preparation, where two accounts — one sociological, the other existential — are given. The general nature and value of history as a study is the topic of the third chapter.

The fourth chapter is somewhat different, and I had trouble getting my co-editor to see the point of it (perhaps because I was unclear myself). Its topic is "inquiry and the History of Education." Maybe the thing to say is that the chapter is more obviously pedagogical than any of the rest in the book. It contains two essays, one by myself, on what is involved in teaching and learning any subject as a skill; I oriented my essay to the study of history of education.

Chapter Five is a discussion of "Concepts in History." "Facts," "cause," and "values" are discussed, though there are other concepts central to the study of history that could be discussed as well. I want students to see how central these concepts are; how their definition makes a difference in the study and interpretations of history. The last chapter is called "Doing History," where there are two examples of historical investigation at work, using the skills previously discussed, and leading to conclusions that challenge the conventional ideas with which the examples began.

I cannot be concrete about the success of the first edition. I never had a report of sales in the eight years since its publication. About three years after its publication I had a call from a colleague in another university who wanted permission to xerox portions of it for his class. He had been told by the publisher that it had sold out and was being reprinted, but it would not be ready for his use. Well, I thought it must be a moderate success, though I did not expect to see it on the *New York Times* best seller list. Further time went by, and around 1981 Alfred Schenkman told me that it was about to sell out again and asked if I would like to revise and update it rather than simply have it reprinted again. Of course I would. I had some revisions already in mind.

But first I thought, here was an opportunity to get a report on its use. Because I was going to do the second edition myself, I told Schenkman that my former co-editor would want a report of the earlier sales and royalties. He replied that "the book did not sell all that well" and sent a small check for the co-editor. That seemed like a contradiction to me, but it was not important as long as I could do the second edition. I gave the check to the co-editor.

The second edition, published in 1984, has some changes and an additional chapter. The added chapter is about "Recent Trends in History and Education," and has discussions of oral history, psychohistory, and quantohistory. Several changes were made. I changed the essays in the chapter on the history of history of education; added another reading to the chapter on the role of history of education in teacher preparation, to represent another point of view; and brought the suggested readings up to date.

The readings are among some of the best in the fields, I think, and come from some of the best sources: *Harvard Educational Review*, *History of Education Quarterly*, *Daedalus*, *Teachers College Record*, and from books. Two of the essays I wrote myself, one on psychohistory and the other on "Beginning Inquiry in History of Education." The readings include Carl Becker's "Everyman His Own Historian" and "What Are Historical Facts?"; Sol Cohen's "The History of the History of American Education, 1900-1976 . . ."; Howard Zinn's "What Is Radical History?"; E.H. Carr's "Causation in History"; Sidney Ratner's "Facts and Values in History"; Ronald J. Grele's "Movement Without Aim: Methodological and Theoretical Problems in Oral History"; Frank E. Manuel's "The Use and Abuse of Psychology in History"; and William O. Aydelotte's "Quantification in History." All are classics, I think.

The first edition of the book was reviewed in *History of Education Quarterly* and *Educational Studies*. Both reviews are fair, I think (maybe because they are complimentary). In *History of Education Quarterly* (18/2, Summer, 1978, pp. 211-215), Toby Edson says that we might have overestimated that the intended audience — teachers-in-training; actually, undergraduate students — will benefit from the book. Paraphrasing Carl Becker, he suspects that "'Everyteacher' simply does not have the time or the inclination to become his or her own historian." I must say that I agree with him, but perhaps for reasons other than he gives, which I will mention below.

Edson says that "other audiences, such as graduate students and teachers of educational research, educational history, and educational foundations, will find [the book] of great actual value." Here too I agree. In fact, the book has been used in graduate courses. One prospective use is in qualitative research courses, which are becoming more popular in colleges of education. The Ph.D. program in my own college now enables students to take a qualitative research track, in contrast to quantitative tracks, in which general methods of educational research, a qualitative foundations of educational research, and a course in a specific qualitative method — history, philosophy, ethnography — are combined. My book has been used and may be useful for those students who want to use historical methodology in the study of educational problems. There is no course in our history or foundations departments that treats this specific topic. My book and other primers — introductions to the methodology — are all we have.

James Giarelli reviewed the first edition in *Educational Studies* (8/2, Summer, 1977, pp. 185-188). He says that it is "atypical" and thus requires "some changes in its instructional use." His point is the same one with which I began these remarks. Because the book is not a factual or an interpretative account of history of education, there must be a different source used as a companion text for that content. Giarelli also

believes that someone teaching from my book will have to assume a different role in relation to students than is usual for a teacher. He will have to "accept the faltering steps of first-time researchers; the evaluation of progressive understanding instead of factual retention; and a commitment to a questioning attitude that seeks to make the study of history meaningful to a variety of individual interests." Specifically, in one of my own essays, I relate that I require history of education students to research an interest of their own and present their findings to the class. I even have students criticize their own and other students work, and I reprinted one of those criticisms in my book as an example.

Some of my colleagues are worried about this activity. They think that the students do not know enough yet to be teaching others, that some of the important data about history of education will not get taught. (This is one of Harvey Neufeldt's criticisms. See below.) That belies a different attitude than I have about truth and pedagogy. But not to argue that, the hazard can be minimized if, as Giarelli says, companion books are used in the class and the teacher is alert to keeping the discussion on track and moving forward.

Reviews of the second edition have not been published yet, as far as I know. Harvey Neufeldt reviewed it at a meeting of the Southern History of Education Society in Atlanta last March, 1985, to which I made a reply. His review is to appear in a forthcoming issue of *Educational Studies*. I have read the manuscript; it is somewhat milder than the spoken comments.

Because of the way he was trained in history, Neufeldt is disturbed by my functionalist, pragmatic approach to history and education. He notes that neither of Carl Becker's essays included in the volume "provide the historian with adequate guidelines for distinguishing history from propaganda." Thus he says that Becker's idea is that "history is a bag of tricks we play upon the dead." The quote is from Voltaire, I believe, and should not be confused with Becker. Certainly Becker believes no such thing; it is Neufeldt's evaluation of Becker's approach to history. Becker's and my views are "presentist" and "value-laden," as Neufeldt puts it. The way to distinguish propaganda from history is not by *a priori* rules but by judging the way the researcher does his work: is it based on evidence, is it open to refutation, is it modest in scope, are other accounts more satisfactory, does it leave room for further development?

When it comes to psychohistory, Neufeldt is similarly skittish. "Such an undertaking," he thinks, "would be risky." Of course it would. All inquiry and interpretation is risky. How is psychohistory different from anything else? Simply because it uses psychoanalytic theories of the unconscious, perhaps. But it must have evidence to warrant the use of those theories. Frank Manual's article on the use of psychology in history is as careful as anything can be about the subject. He is cautious, and not

on a bandwagon. He concludes, "Economic history has become respectable, and who would now demean the history of labor, or the history of consumption patterns? I merely advocate adding to them a history of other needs and expressions of living. . . . Now that we have . . . recognized the claims of hands and stomach to a share in human history, let us make ready to welcome the other more secret and hidden parts of man into the temple." I agree. I cannot see virtue in avoiding risk by inaction.

I think that Neufeldt mistakes the purpose of my book. It is that I want to *introduce* students to a discussion of history and history of education, not, at this time, to say the last word about it. Thus, Neufeldt's criticism that I ignore criticisms against presentism and radical revisionism, for example, are beside the point. His comment that Arthur Schlessinger's article, "The Humanist Looks at Empirical Research," only reinforces common criticisms or biases of humanists and adds little to the discussion of quantification in history in fact makes my point very well. Schlessinger was included not to rebut or balance the advocates of quantohistory, not to give a final judgment on the matter, but to show that there is another point of view. In this case, Schlessinger makes a useful point or two, though this general point of view seems to me to be obviously the loser to those who advocate quantohistory.

I can make a more fundamental criticism of my own book. I have come to believe that it is not for beginning students but for advanced students. In that, I agree with Edson's evaluation. My own use of the book has shown me that its motive is confused. On the one hand I believe that students learn things more readily by doing them directly. On the other hand, I have written a book that discusses *how* to do things before one does them. That is inconsistent and, as well, has been shown to be impractical. A recent book that I reviewed puts it this way:

> "It is vital for students to know something about a field before engaging in the heuristic scramble for solutions to its problems. Specific instruction about problem solving therefore should be delayed until later in the term, if not to advanced courses" (Stanford C. Erickson, *The Essence of Good Teaching* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984), p. 93).

This view — from scientific studies of teaching — confirms what I have noticed myself in scholars, that they tend not to give commentary on their methods of scholarship, preferring rather to do it, until they are older and more established in the profession. By that time, they are looking backwards, perhaps for the benefit of students. While my book may be helpful for advanced students, there is no substitute for the activity itself.

Authors sometimes tell of their difficulties with writing and publishing. I do not have much to tell. My relation with the publisher, Alfred Schenkman, has been cordial though odd. While I had a contract to publish the first edition, I never, as I have said, had a report of the sales.

The book was reprinted once, and now I have revised it. Yet Alfred said that it was not a big seller! Our agreement to revise was simply a "go ahead" over the telephone — no contract. Schenkman appeared to run a one-man show. He would answer his own telephone and write his own letters in longhand. He was not in good health and had had a leg amputated a few years ago. Toward the end of 1983 his second leg was amputated, but he still worked, and when I would point something out to him, he would say, with truth, that he did not have a leg to stand on! An expected pun, perhaps, but it was his. For a long while I dallied in getting the revision done, but finally I thought I better do it before Alfred died and I was left high and dry.

I submitted my manuscript early in 1984 and read the proofs in Maine in the summer. When I returned to Florida in August, I had received a post-card announcement, as some of you may have too, that the book was about to be published and one should act without delay to get on the order list. He said the post-card was "an exciting way tested by historians and educators to help give communications a new lift," and that "the new, long awaited edition of . . . the book itself will give you a lift." That was his kind of humor. Shortly afterwards I heard that he had died.

After a decent interval I inquired about my book. The one-man publishing company was being reorganized and it still would be published. Another wait. Then, because in Florida we have to list our productivity for the year if we expect to get pay increases, I inquired again, and lo and behold the book was out. (A colleague even told me he had ordered a copy!) "Do you suppose I might have a copy?", I asked. It soon came, looking very nice and impressive. But as I leafed through it I discovered 30 pages in the middle that were bound in upside down! I had a vision that they might all be that way, and that the Dean would see me and my students reading the book upside down. But after a search it was discovered that I had gotten the only defective copy. What luck!

Then I inquired if the permission payments for the reprinted articles had been made. I had asked Alfred to make them, as I supposed he had done with the first edition. The reply was that as Alfred was not good at keeping records, no evidence of the payments could be found, but, not to worry, if any of the authors make demands, the company would make the payments after the fact. I am pleased to say that no claims have been made so far.

I do not mean for this saga to be negative, but rather to characterize Alfred Schenkman. I grew to like him because he was so informal and off-beat. And though I did not receive any royalties on the first edition, if that helped to keep his one-man shop afloat, it is worth it. The books he published for me are very well done — they are attractive and, with the exception of one copy, competently printed and bound. The company now is being organized and run by people just as cordial as Alfred. I wish

them well. They have done well for me.

Part VI
Program and Proceedings

Midwest History of Education Society
1985 Annual Meeting

Friday, October 24, 1985

1st Session **9:30-10:30** **Room 30**

Education in Nineteenth-Century Europe

Trevor J. Phillips, Bowling Green State University
"The Ragged Schools of Victorian England"

Charles R. Wolf, The Spencer Foundation, Chicago
"Going to School in Early Nineteenth-Century Naples: The Youth of Francesco De Sanctis"

2nd Session **10:45-11:45** **Room 30**

Gender and Culture in American Educational History

Bonnie Handler, Central Connecticut State University
"Female Participation in the N.E.A., 1857-1912"

Guadalupe San Miguel, Jr., University of California, Santa Barbara
"Formative Influences on the Mexican-American Mind in the 1920s"

Lunch **11:45-1:15**

3rd Session **1:15-3:45** **Room 30**

Varieties of Quantitative History

David L. Angus, University of Michigan
"Ethnicity and School Attendance in the Nineteenth Century: Theory, Comparison, and Analysis"

William Eaton, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
"The Costs of a Rural School — 1875-1910"

Mary Grant, University of Toledo
"Analysis of Manuscript Census Data for Fifteen- to Seventeen-Year-Olds in Toledo, Ohio, 1850-1900"

Jeffrey E. Mirel, Northern Illinois University
"Curriculum Change in Detroit High Schools, 1927-1940: A Geographic and Quantitative Analysis"

Sam R. Snyder, University of Toledo
"Occupational Mobility in Graduates and Non-Graduates of an Urban High School, 1915-1940"

4th Session **4:00-5:00 p.m.** **Room 30**

Authors on Their Work

Robert J. Sherman, University of Florida
Understanding History of Education

James C. Carper, Mississippi State University
Thomas Hunt, Virginia Tech
Religious Schooling in America

Business Meeeting **5:00-5:30** **Room 30**

Social Hour **5:30-6:30** **President's Room**

Saturday, October 26, 1985

5th Session **9:15-10:15** **Room 30**

Classical Ideas in Theory and Practice

J.J. Chambliss, Rutgers University
"Oratory as Conduct in Cicero and Quintilian"

George Arakapadavil, Illinois State University
"Loyola and the Jesuits: Masters of Method, Management, and Teacher Preparation"

6th Session **10:30-12:00** **Room 30**

Historical Deja vu

Ellen M. Brier, University of Illinois at Chicago
"The Rhetoric and the Reality of Academic Excellence at Cornell University, 1868-1890"

Eileen M. Eagan, University of Houston at Clear Lake City
"Higher Education and the Cold War: George D. Stoddard and the University of Illinois, 1946-1954"

Erwin V. Johanningmeier, University of South Florida
"William Chandler Bagley on Race and Gender"

Minutes

Twenty-first Annual Meeting
Midwest History of Education Society
Loyola University of Chicago
October 25-26, 1985

The annual business meeting of the Midwest History of Education Society was called to order by President Michael Perko at 4:59 p.m. in Room 30, Marquette Center, Loyola University.

Reading of the minutes of the previous meeting was dispensed with because they were published in the journal.

Ed Rutkowski distributed the treasurer's report. He noted that the treasury is solid.

Journal subscriptions are slowly increasing. Circulation is about seventy. Of these, thirty-five are institutional subscribers. Ed noted that he is not satisfied with the binding of the journal. The problem is in the equipment available to him. Dave Angus suggested stapling.

Vice-President Chris Eisle reported that 750 calls for papers were mailed. He received a total of sixteen proposals — all were accepted. Participants were from nine states, all three coasts, and the South.

A resolution of appreciation was passed thanking the Department of Educational Administration and Foundations, Illinois State University, for typing and printing the program.

Thanks were also expressed to Loyola University of Chicago for providing meeting rooms.

Vice-President Eisle announced that a regional meeting of Division G of AERA is to be held in New Orleans. Interested people should talk with Erwin Johanningmeier.

The Social and Educational Policy section of the Department of Foundations, Loyola University of Chicago, invited the group to meet next year at Loyola. Moved, seconded, unanimously carried that this offer be accepted.

Moved and seconded that next year's meeting be on Friday and Saturday of the fourth week of October unless there is a conflict with HES or AESA. Officers may adjust the meeting by one week in the event of conflict. Passed.

Slate of officer nominees: Chris Eisle for President, L. Glenn Smith for Vice-President and Jeffrey Mirel for Secretary. Ed Rutkowski will continue to serve as Treasurer and Editor. Moved and seconded that slate be accepted. Carried.

Bill Eaton noted the move of HEQ to Indiana University under the editorship of B. Edward McClellan.

Meeting adjourned at 5:16 to President's Room for refreshments.

Respectfully submitted,
L. Glenn Smith

Directory of Attendance

David Angus
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109

George Arakapadavil
Illinois State University
331 DeGarmo Hall
Normal, Illinois 60680

M. Bograd
(Guest)
Princeton, New Jersey 08542

Ellen M. Brier
University of Illinois-Chicago
Center for Educ. Development
808 South Wood Street
Chicago, Illinois 60680

Jim Carper
Mississippi State University
Box 5365
Mississippi State, MI 39762

J.J. Chambliss
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, NJ 08901

Jacqueline Cleslak
Loyola University
Chicago, IL 60611

Bob Clenkus
820 North Michigan
Chicago, IL 60611

Peter Collins
Marquette University
Milwaukee, WI 53233

Stephen M. Colby
5737 South Kimbark
Chicago, IL 60637

Lawrence Dennis
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, IL 62901

William Eaton
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, IL 62901

Chris Eisele
Illinois State University
331 DeGarmo Hall
Normal, IL 61761

Dommie Everett
Lewis University
Romeoville, IL 60441

Janet Fredericks
Loyola University
7853 North Kilbourn
Skokie, IL 60076

Marcel Fredericks
Loyola University
7853 North Kilborn
Skokie, IL 60076

Edward E. Gordon
Loyola University
220 East Walton
Chicago, IL 60611

Mary C. Grant
University of Toledo
2801 West Brancroft Street
Toledo, OH 43606

Gerald L. Gutek
Loyola University
Chicago, IL 60525

Bonnie S. Handler
Central Connecticut State Univ
109 Marcus White
New Britain, CN 06051

Erwin V. Johanningmeier
University of Southern Florida
Tampa, FL 33620

A. Hugh Jones
Ball State University
808 Teachers College
Muncie, IN 47306

Jack R. Kirby
Indiana University-Purdue
University-Fort Wayne
519 W. Washington Blvd.
Ft. Wayne, IN 46802

Robert Lang
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, IL 60115

Timothy Leonard
St. Xavier College
Chicago, IL 60655

Pat Marks
Loyola University
5109 W. Deming, Pl.

Jeffrey Mirel
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, IL 60115

Frank Nelson
University of Wisconsin
Milwaukee, WI 53201

Fr. Michael Perko
Loyola University
820 Michigan Avenue
Chicago, IL 60611

Trevor Phillips
Dept. Ed. Founds & Inquiry
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, OH 43402

David B. Ripley
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, IL 60115

Teryl Ann Rosch
Loyola University
9301 Oak Park
Morton Grove, IL 60053

Edward Rutkowski
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50614

Robert R. Sherman
University of Florida
Normal Hall
Gainsville, FL 32611

Glen Smith
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, IL 60611

Joan K. Smith
Loyola University
131 South C
Oak Park, IL 60302

Kay Smith
Loyola University
Chicago, IL 60611

Sam Snyder
University of Toledo
2801 W. Bancroft Street
Toledo, OH 43606

Alan Wieder
University of Wisconsin-
Oshkosh
Oshkosh, WI 54901

Charles R. Wolf
Spencer Foundation
875 N. Michigan Avenue
Chicago, IL 60611

John Wozniak
Loyola University at Chicago
Chicago, IL 60611